

**Hunters Point Shipyard
Installation Restoration Program
Public Information Materials**

**23 October 2003
Public Meeting/Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Held at Dago Mary's Restaurant
San Francisco, California**

Materials/Handout Include:

- Agenda for 23 October 2003 RAB
- Meeting/Minutes from 25 September 2003 RAB Meeting
 - Includes: Action Items from 25 September 2003 RAB Meeting; and
 - Table 1, RAB Roll-Call Sheet
- Reporters Transcript from 23 October 2003 RAB Meeting
- Monthly Progress Report, August 2003
- Monthly Progress Report, September 2003
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel E Landfill Gas Removal Action Update, 23 October 2003
- PowerPoint Presentation, HRA Update, 23 October 2003
- HPS Fact Sheet No. 4, Historical Radiological Assessment, October 2003
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB, Economic Committee, 07 October 2003 with Handouts regarding CECC-C, 27 March 2000; and Section 2912 of the FY 1994 Defense Authorization Act
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB, Membership/Bylaws & Community Outreach Subcommittee, 14 October 2003
- Flyer, ARC Ecology, Community Open House, 07 November 2003
- Pamphlet, San Francisco Department of Public Health, We Can Help
- Post Card, San Francisco HRC, Environmental Racism Workshop IV, 29 October 2003

Standard Handouts Not Included in this Packet:

- HPS List of Acronyms and Abbreviations
- HPS Mailing List Update Form
- HPS RAB Membership Application Form
- HPS Bylaws

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) - MEETING AGENDA
THURSDAY, 23 OCTOBER 2003**

Day/Date:
Thursday – 23 October 2003
Time:
6:00 p.m. to 8:10 p.m.

Location:
Dago Mary's Restaurant
Hunters Point Shipyard
Building # 916
San Francisco

Facilitator: Marsha Pendergrass

Time	Topic	Leader
6:00 p.m. – 6:05 p.m.	Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review	Marsha Pendergrass <i>Facilitator</i>
6:05 p.m. – 6:10 p.m.	Approval of Meeting Minutes from 25 Sept 2003 RAB Meeting • Action Items	Marsha Pendergrass
6:10 p.m. – 6:15 p.m.	Navy Announcements	Keith Forman <i>Navy Co-chair</i>
	Community Co-chair Report/Other Announcements	Lynne Brown <i>Community Co-chair</i>
6:15 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.	Landfill Gas Removal Action Update	Maz Mazowiecki
7:00 p.m. – 7:10 p.m.	BREAK	
7:10 p.m. – 7:45 p.m.	HRA Update	Laurie Lowman RASO
7:45 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	Subcommittee Reports	Subcommittee Leaders
8:00 p.m. – 8:10 p.m.	Future Agenda Topics/ Open Question & Answer	Marsha Pendergrass
8:10 p.m.	Adjournment	Marsha Pendergrass

HPS web site: <http://www.efds.w.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm>

RAB Navy Contact: Mr. Keith Forman (619) 532-0913 or (415) 525-6216

- - - P U B L I C N O T I C E - - -
H U N T E R S P O I N T S H I P Y A R D
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

6:00 P.M. - 8:10 P.M.

Thursday, October 23, 2003

Dago Mary's Restaurant

Hunters Point Shipyard, Building #916
San Francisco

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) is composed of concerned citizens and government representatives involved in the environmental cleanup program at Hunters Point Shipyard. Community participation and input is important and appreciated. The purpose of this meeting is to present the community with the current status and future cleanup schedule for Hunters Point Shipyard and to address the concerns of the entire community.

The interested public is welcome!

For more information about this meeting and the Installation Restoration Program at Hunters Point Shipyard, please contact:

Mr. Keith Forman, BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100, San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 532-0913 or (415) 525-6216

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
25 SEPTEMBER 2003

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:05 P.M. to 8:15 P.M., Thursday, 25 September 2003 at Dago Mary's Restaurant (Building #916 at the Shipyard). A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in the Information Repository for Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) and on the Internet at www.efds.w.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm. The list of agenda topics is provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items that were requested and/or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

AGENDA TOPICS:

- 1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- 2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from 28 August 2003 RAB Meeting
- 3) San Francisco Police Department Report on HPS incident and activity in Parcel A
- 4) Update on Area Fires
- 5) Landfill Gas Removal Action Update
- 6) Subcommittee Reports
- 7) Future Agenda Topics/Open Question & Answer
- 8) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for 25 September 2003 RAB
- Meeting/Minutes from 28 August 2003 RAB Meeting
 - Includes: Action Items from 28 August 2003 RAB Meeting; and
 - Table 1, RAB Roll-Call Sheet
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel E Landfill Gas Removal Action Update, 25 September 2003
- HPS Fact Sheet No. 3, Historical Radiological Assessment, September 2003
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB Technical and Risk Review Subcommittees, 19 September 2003
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB, Membership/Bylaws & Community Outreach Subcommittee, 17 September 2003

Welcome / Introductions / Agenda and Meeting Minutes Review

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. All in attendance made self-introductions. Ms. Pendergrass began the meeting and asked if there were any changes to the minutes; of which there were none. The meeting minutes were approved. Lynne Brown, RAB Community Co-chair, made a motion to extend the meeting to 8:30 P.M. to allow for additional time during the subcommittee reports for a guest speaker. The motion carried.

Ms. Pendergrass reviewed the Action Items contained in the August minutes and asked for a status of each item. Both of the carry-over items were completed to the satisfaction of the RAB. Of the four new action items, Don Capobres, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, (SFRA), distributed five copies of the sublease agreements. Four of the documents were distributed to each of the four subcommittee leaders, the fifth to be placed in the Branch Library Information Repository (IR). Mr. Keith Forman, Navy Co-Chair, stated that the Navy will discuss the SF Fire Department and Federal Fire Department fire reports later in the meeting during that presentation. The request that air quality samples be collected as a part of all future HPS fires is

1 still under evaluation, and will be carried over to next month. The remaining action item was
2 resolved to the satisfaction of the RAB.

3 Navy and Community Co-chair Reports/Other Announcements

4 Mr. Forman indicated that the name tents for all of the RAB members have been replaced and
5 now include the member's affiliation. He also said that the Membership & Bylaws
6 Subcommittee has been restructured and is now the Membership, Bylaws, and Community
7 Outreach Subcommittee. Mr. Forman announced that the Navy is hosting a public meeting at
8 6:30 P.M., on 30 September, at Dago Mary's to discuss the five-year Record of Decision (ROD)
9 review document. He invited all in attendance to that meeting. Mr. Forman also said that the
10 Community Information Fair has been rescheduled and will be held from 10:00 A.M. to 3:00
11 P.M., on November 15th, at the E.P. Mills Community Center. His final announcement was that
12 due to the recent hurricane on the east coast, the Navy's Radiological Affairs Support Office
13 (RASO) presentation will be rescheduled to the 23 October RAB meeting.

14 Mr. Brown had no announcements and yielded the floor to Georgia Oliva, RAB member.
15 Ms. Oliva said that the Navy recently identified cesium-137 in the ventilation system and
16 concrete flooring in Building 366 in Parcel D, and that a number of the artist-tenants have been
17 asked to relocate. She said that eight months earlier, the Navy reported that there was nothing
18 wrong with the building. She invited a number of the artists currently leasing studio space in
19 Building 366 to attend the RAB meeting. She said one of the artists believe a possible eviction
20 from Building 366 is part of a real estate deal. Ms. Oliva also said that the master tenant and two
21 workers recently repaired the roof on Building 366 and are concerned that they may have had
22 exposure to cesium-137. She invited any of the artists in attendance to ask questions but
23 Ms. Pendergrass requested that questions be held until later in the evening during the scheduled
24 public comment section. Mr. Brown suggested that the artists be invited to one of the
25 subcommittee meetings in October to hear and ask questions at the RASO presentation.

26 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 to 8:10 P.M., Thursday evening,**
27 **23 October 2003 at Dago Mary's Restaurant, Building #916 on the Shipyard.**

28 San Francisco Police Department Report on HPS incident and activity in Parcel A

29 Captain Dennis Martel, San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), introduced himself to the
30 RAB as a 31-year veteran of the police force. His work has included Homeland Security training
31 for the department. He has been stationed at Hunters Point for about a year, and the past month
32 has seen him stationed with the crime prevention company. He explained that the crime
33 prevention company is comprised primarily of specialized units, such as the special operations
34 group, the Honda motorcycle unit, the bomb unit, the K-9 unit, and criminalistic forensic
35 services. Capt. Martel apologized for the miscommunication that resulted in Sergeant Potter not
36 attending last month's RAB meeting, as scheduled. Capt. Martel stressed that the SFPD is part of
37 the community and works hard to be good neighbors. He gave his office phone number,
38 (415) 671-3104, and invited attendees to call should they ever have a question about police
39 department activities at HPS.

40 Capt. Martel then gave some background surrounding the detonation of explosive munitions on
41 Parcel A on 30 June 2003. He said a grenade-like device was transported by SFPD bomb
42 technicians to Building 606 after being discovered at the home of a deceased Ingleside resident.
43 The following day, officers had planned to transport the device to the Police Department's
44 facility outside of the San Francisco county limits for routine disposal. Upon further inspection
45 and research however, bomb technicians deemed the device unsafe to transport. SFPD notified
46 the Navy that they planned a controlled detonation of the device on Parcel A in a large hole dug

1 for that purpose. The device was subsequently detonated by bomb technicians. Capt. Martel said
2 that this action was not stipulated in their lease agreement but was due to the unique
3 circumstances outlined above. He assured the RAB that this was an isolated incident and would
4 not occur again. Capt. Martel paused in his presentation to take questions from the RAB.

5 Mr. Brown stated that transporting the device through the community was wrong and it should
6 have been detonated in-place. Capt. Martel agreed but replied that, at the time, the bomb
7 technicians on-scene believed that the device was safe to transport to Building 606. Karen Pierce,
8 RAB member, said that detonating the device at Hunters Point was akin to creating a "dirty
9 bomb" since the Shipyard is a federal Superfund site. She said a future occurrence should never
10 be allowed to happen. Marie Harrison, RAB member, expressed strong resentment that the police
11 department would transport an explosive device through the Bayview-Hunters Point community.
12 She asked if SFPD owned a container of some sort where the device could have been detonated
13 and enclosed, rather than detonated in the ground where there is potential for chemical
14 contamination. Capt. Martel replied that the device was transported to Building 606 in a
15 containment magazine, or blast-resistant box, which is designed for that purpose. He explained
16 that if the device had unexpectedly detonated, the magazine would have probably contained the
17 blast but would have certainly caused significant damage to the vehicle and the driver.

18 Maurice Campbell, RAB member, said that at a previous RAB meeting the Navy responded that
19 they were unaware that SFPD had detonated a device on Parcel A. He said that clearer lines of
20 communication need to be developed so that Mr. Forman is aware of what happens on the
21 Shipyard. Mr. Forman replied that SFPD, via the City of San Francisco, had properly informed
22 the Navy. It was some time after the incident occurred, however, before he became aware of it.
23 Mr. Campbell restated his request that information be directed to Mr. Forman.

24 Keith Tisdell, RAB member, asked if Capt. Martel was fully aware of the details of SFPD's lease
25 agreement, which clearly prohibits disturbing the soil at the Shipyard. He also asked if the Fire
26 Department was on-site in the event of a larger emergency. Officer Ellestad, SFPD bomb squad,
27 replied that the Fire Department was present.

28 Ms. Pendergrass then summed up some additional discussion around the table. She said that the
29 RAB seems not so much concerned that this device may have caused damage in an of itself, but
30 rather that some hazardous contamination from the soil may have become airborne as a result of
31 the explosion, creating a health risk to nearby residents. Ms. Harrison and Ms. Pierce disagreed,
32 saying that they were most upset that the Police Department would value protecting a piece of
33 equipment over the lives of the community residents.

34 Capt. Martel continued his presentation and discussed the department's training maneuvers that
35 are routinely conducted on Parcel A. He said the presence of the roads and buildings there are
36 valuable tools for officers conducting urban training maneuvers. Officers participating in the
37 training are issued special weapons as part of the safety protocol. He explained that the guns fire
38 paint ball-type rounds. Capt. Martel concluded his presentation with the assurance that the police
39 department has never fired live rounds on Hunters Point as part of their training maneuvers and
40 never will.

41 Break called (7:15 P.M.)

42 **SFPD Report on HPS incident and activity in Parcel A (cont.)**

43 Ms. Pendergrass called the meeting back to order and resumed taking questions from the floor.
44 Mr. Tisdell asked if the lease allows for training maneuvers on Parcel A. Capt. Martel replied
45 that it was his understanding that the lease does allow limited exercises on Parcel A but that he
46 would have to look into this question further.

1 Mr. Tompkins asked if the department was aware of the presence of asbestos in some of the
2 buildings on Parcel A. Capt. Martel replied that he was aware of the presence of asbestos but the
3 training maneuvers stop short of entering any of the buildings. Mr. Tompkins followed his
4 question and asked what the Navy is doing to control access and enforce lease terms.
5 Mr. Forman replied that in this case, SFRA is the landlord overseeing the SFPD lease.

6 Mr. Tompkins then made a motion that all SFPD activities on Parcel A cease and desist until
7 clear lines of communication are established. Ms. Harrison requested clarification on the motion
8 regarding who will be the responsible party for the motion, the Navy or SFRA. Mr. Forman
9 replied that SFRA is the leaseholder in this case. Mr. Capobres agreed that the request should be
10 directed to SFRA. Ms. Pierce suggested that the motion include a requirement that SFRA and
11 SFPD open a dialogue with the community. Ms. Pendergrass restated the motion for the RAB
12 and asked if there was any further discussion before the motion is put to a vote. Mr. Capobres
13 said that SFRA is currently in lease negotiations with SFPD for renewal of their lease. He added
14 that SFRA will escalate the discussions to include the community. Capt. Martel volunteered that
15 SFPD will immediately cease operations on Parcel A until the issues are resolved. The statement
16 was applauded by the RAB. Ms. Pendergrass said that Capt. Martel's statement meant the
17 motion on the floor was rendered moot, and it was therefore withdrawn. She said that there was
18 still a request that the results of the discussions between SFRA and SFPD be presented to the
19 RAB or a subcommittee. Mr. Forman suggested that it be directed to the Membership, Bylaws,
20 and Community Outreach Subcommittee.

21 Ms. Pendergrass closed the discussion at this point to continue the meeting per the agenda. She
22 said that the meeting was running long and asked the RAB which of the remaining presentations,
23 if either, should be postponed to a future RAB meeting. The RAB voted to postpone the Landfill
24 Gas Removal Action Update presentation.

25 Update on Area Fires

26 Pat Brooks, Navy Lead RPM, gave the report on the area fires. He said that there were 17 fires
27 over the summer. He has fire incident reports for 10 of them and the remaining seven were
28 identified in the Community Notification Plan messages broadcast via e-mail. The reported fires
29 were predominantly grass and brush fires that started outside Navy property and then migrated
30 onto Navy property.

31 Mr. Brooks said that the San Francisco Fire Department and the Hunters Point Fire Department
32 established an automatic aid agreement in October 2001, whereby one fire department can
33 request aid from the other. Mr. Brooks said he has looked into some of the city ordinances
34 regarding weed abatement and found that it requires flammable material be kept 30 feet away
35 from buildings and structures. The ordinance does not apply to open fields. Mr. Brooks said the
36 Navy currently has several contracts for weed abatement on the Shipyard. These contracts
37 require weeds to be kept mowed within 50 of the fence line. He concluded his presentation and
38 asked for questions.

39 Mr. Tisdell asked if the city was helping with weed abatement. He said he was concerned that
40 the weeds absorb toxins in the soil, along with nutrients. Amy Brownell, SF Department of
41 Public Health, replied that she didn't know but would look into the question regarding weed
42 abatement on city property adjacent to the Shipyard.

43 Second break called (8:10 P.M.)

44 Ms. Pendergrass reconvened the RAB meeting and requested subcommittee reports.

Subcommittee Updates

Radiological Subcommittee (Ahimsa Sumchai, Leader)

Dr. Sumchai said the subcommittee discussed the proposed removal action in IR-02. She said Mr. Forman reassured the subcommittee that the health and safety of the community will be the highest priority.

Dr. Sumchai expressed regret that some of the artists present at the beginning of tonight's RAB meeting were no longer in attendance. She said she would like to convene an emergency meeting of the subcommittee to discuss the health and safety issues connected to Building 366. She said she is not convinced that the information from the findings in the drains and vents are consistent with current health and safety standards. The subcommittee will continue to monitor the Navy's efforts on the removal action at IR-02.

Dr. Sumchai said the next meeting of the subcommittee will be announced at a later date.

Dr. Sumchai conceded the remainder of her time to J.R. Manual for a special report on legal issues related to the Navy's proposed radium dial removal action. Mr. Manual introduced attorney Richard Chiozza. He said he invited Mr. Chiozza to give his opinion on the Navy's plan to remove soil from IR-02, screen it for radium dials, and then replace the soil into the excavation. Mr. Manual said the RAB was concerned that replacing the soil without sampling it for chemical contamination would constitute a potential new chemical release.

Mr. Chiozza introduced himself and said he has considerable experience with land use, environmental policy, and hazardous waste and toxics. Dr. Sumchai restated the Navy's plan for the removal action and asked Mr. Chiozza if this represents a new release. Mr. Chiozza replied that he believed that it would constitute a release under both CERCLA and NEPA. Mr. Forman responded that the field work is an interim removal action, not a remedial action under CERCLA. This removal action is the first step in applying the final remedial action over the entire IR-02 area. Mr. Forman said the Navy feels the radiological removal action is consistent with the larger remedial action. Mr. Chiozza agreed that this approach is correct.

Mr. Tompkins said that the Department of Toxic Substances Control was in disagreement with the Navy's approach to sifting the soil without testing for chemical contaminants prior to replacing the soil in the excavation. Mr. Tompkins asked if the Navy should postpone the removal action until the issue is resolved. Mr. Chiozza agreed that this would be a prudent action. Mr. Forman replied that the Navy has only prepared an action memorandum at this point in time, and that the work plan has yet to be issued. He suggested that the RAB hold off on discussing the fine details of the removal action until the work plan is released for public comment. Mr. Forman said the Technical Review Subcommittee would be the ideal place to discuss the work plan once it is released on 17 October 2003.

Membership, Bylaws, and Community Outreach Subcommittee (Keith Tisdell, Leader)

Melita Rines gave the report for the Membership, Bylaws and Community Outreach Subcommittee. She stated that draft revised HPS Bylaws were sent to RAB members. Ms. Rines made a motion to accept the revised bylaws as written. The motion was seconded and carried. A typographical error was noted on the new RAB Membership Application and a request was made to correct it.

The next meeting of the Membership & Bylaws Subcommittee will be at 6:00 P.M., October 14th, at the Anna Waden Branch Library.

1 Technical Review Subcommittee (Lea Loizos, Leader) held jointly with the Risk Review and
2 Health Assessment Subcommittee (Karen Pierce, Leader)

3 Lea Loizos, RAB member, said the two subcommittees met to discuss the upcoming Parcel B
4 five-year review. She said the details are contained in the subcommittee meeting minutes.
5 Ms. Loizos said that Arc Ecology has posted the draft Final Parcel B Five-year Review
6 document online, at www.communitywindowontheshipyard.org click on "Alert".

7 Ms. Loizos said that the joint subcommittees will hold two meetings in October. The first will be
8 at 6:00 P.M., October 16th, at the Milton Meyers auditorium to discuss the health risks of the fires.
9 The second meeting will be 6:00 P.M., October 21st, at the Anna Waden Library to discuss the
10 radium dial time-critical removal action.

11 Economic Development Subcommittee (Maurice Campbell, Leader)

12 Mr. Campbell stated that the subcommittee met on September 9th to discuss the HRC database.
13 He said the database has been forwarded to Chon Son of the Navy. The database will help Navy
14 contractors locate local community contractors.

15 Mr. Campbell said the next meeting of the subcommittee will be October 17th, at 2:30 P.M.

16 Other Discussions/Topics

17 The following items were also discussed at the RAB meeting. A verbatim account of these
18 discussions is included in the Information Repository for HPS and may also be found on the HPS
19 web page at www.efdswnavfac.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm

- 20 • Mr. Tompkins restated a request that the Navy and the city treat all fires on the Shipyard
21 and adjacent properties as potentially chemical fires, and to report air quality sample
22 results from every fire.
- 23 • Ms. Loizos announced that Arc Ecology is hosting a workshop at 6:30 P.M., on Thursday,
24 9 October, at the E.P. Mills auditorium to discuss PCB issues.

25 Future Agenda Topics

26 In addition to the standard agenda topics and subcommittee updates, the following topics
27 suggested for next month's RAB meeting include:

- 28 • Landfill Gas Removal Action Update at October RAB meeting.
- 29 • RASO presentation on the Historic Radiological Assessment Update

30 There were no further announcements. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

31 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 to 8:10 P.M., Thursday evening,**
32 **23 October 2003 at Dago Mary's Restaurant, Building #916 on the Shipyard.**

ATTACHMENT A

**25 SEPTEMBER 2003 - RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
2. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
3. Jackie Wright	Pendergrass & Associates
4. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
5. Pat Brooks	Navy, Lead RPM
6. Charles Mazoweicki	Navy
7. Patricia McFadden	Navy
8. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, ROICC Office
9. Lynne Brown	RAB Community Co-chair , Communities for a Better Environment, CFC
10. Andrew Bozeman*	Southeast Sector Community Development Corp, Alternate for RAB member Lani Asher
11. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, R.O.S.E.S.
12. Maurice Campbell	RAB member, BDI, CFC, New California Media
13. Charles Dacus	RAB member, ROSES
14. Marie J. Franklin	RAB member, Shoreview Environmental Justice Movement, Inc
15. Marie Harrison	RAB member, CBE, San Francisco Bay View, Greenaction
16. Mitsuyo Hasegawa	RAB member, JRM Associates
17. Lea Loizos	RAB member, ARC Ecology
18. Kevyn Lutton	RAB member, resident
19. J.R. Manuel	RAB member, JRM Associates, India Basin resident
20. Jesse Mason	RAB member, CFC
21. James Morrison	RAB member, Environmental Technology
22. Georgia Oliva	RAB member, CBE, CCA member
23. Karen Pierce	RAB member, Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic Club, HEAP
24. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
25. Harry Shin	RAB member, Associated Builders
26. Ahimsa Sumchai	RAB member, Bayview-Hunter Point Health & Env Resource Center
27. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, resident
28. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, BVHP Coalition on the Environment
29. Leilani Wright	RAB member, JRM Associates
30. Amy Brownell	RAB member, San Francisco Dept of Public Health
31. Chen Kao	RAB member, Cal Dept Toxic Substances Control
32. Jackie Lane	RAB member, US EPA
33. Julie Menack	RAB member, SF Regional Water Quality Control Board
34. Michael Work	RAB member, US EPA
35. Arvind Acharya	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc
36. Fabian Bailey	Young Community Developers (YCD)
37. Jacqueline Bishop	YCD
38. Patricia Brown	Shipyard Artist
39. Russell Bruno	YCD
40. Kizzy Busby	YCD
41. Don Capobres	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
42. Richard Chiozza	Attorney, guest speaker
43. Deborah Clark	Katz & Associates
44. Penina Coleman	YCD
45. Tommy Conley	YCD
46. Francisco DaCosta	Environmental Justice Advocacy
47. Doug Davenport	Tetra Tech EM Inc
48. Lisa Davis	San Francisco Weekly
49. Steve Delhomme	Tetra Tech EM Inc

50. Leticia Dickerson	YCD
51. Torrio Dickerson	YCD
52. Lem Dozier	Artist
53. Alfonso Durante	YCD
54. Angel Durante	YCD
55. Steve Edde	ITSI
56. Dario Ellington	YCD
57. Ed Ellestad	San Francisco Police Department, bomb squad
58. Komisi Falani	Resident
59. Dominique Forks	Resident
60. Rebecca Fox	Shipyard artist
61. Chris Hanif	YCD
62. Arien Harrison	Community member
63. Bob Hocker	Lennar/BVHP
64. Linda Hope	Shipyard artist
65. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EM Inc
66. Feng Jin	Shipyard artist
67. Raymond Jones	YCD
68. Ronald Keichline	ITSI
69. Stephen LaPlante	Mariner's Village resident
70. Marcus Lewis	YCD
71. John Liskowitz	ARS Technologies
72. Alex MacLeitch	Shipyard Artist
73. Capt. Dennis Martel	San Francisco Police Department
74. Remley McCright	YCD
75. Gregory McLin	YCD
76. Debra Moore	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc
77. David Nguyen	YCD
78. Ladale Noa	YCD
79. Lou Shaw Oliver	YCD
80. DeRoyce Prince	YCD
81. Oscar Ramirez	YCD
82. Starvon Redwood	YCD
83. Dennis Robinson	Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc
84. James Robinson	YCD
85. Karen Rosen	The Point
86. Mildred Sauls Harris	Resident
87. Stephen Scholten	Morgan Heights
88. Alonzo Simpson	YCD
89. Mefiposeta (Murphy) Sione	YCD
90. La Tanya Spears	YCD
91. Miya Stanoff	Shipyard artist
92. Glenn Starr	Foster Wheeler
93. Maria Thomas	YCD
94. Lester Vargas	YCD
95. Jason Webster	Shipyard artist
96. Peter Wilsey	San Francisco Dept of Public Health

Hunters Point Shipyard
RAB Member Roll-Call Sheet

Current RAB Members		Attendance
Name	Affiliation	25-Sep-03
Community		
Brown, Lynne	Community Co-chair, Community First Coalition	
Asher, Lani	Artist on the Shipyard	
Bushnell, Barbara	ROSES	
Campbell, Maurice	New California Media	
Dacus, Sr., Charles L.	ROSES, Resident	
Franklin, Marie J.	Shoreview Environmental Justice Movement, Inc.	
Harrison, Marie	San Francisco Bayview Newspaper	
Hasegawa, Mitsuyo	JRM & Associates	
Jackson, Helen	All Hallows Gardens Residents' Association	
Loizos, Lea	ARC Ecology	
Lutton, Kevyn	Resident	
Manuel, J.R.	JRM & Associates	
Mason, Jesse	Community First Coalition	
Morrison, James	Resident	
Nunley, Jr., Allen	Business Owner, Resident	
va, Georgia	Artist on the Shipyard	
Palega, Sulu	BVHP Boys & Girls Club	
Pierce, Karen	BVHP Democratic Club	
Rines, Melita	India Basin Neighborhood Association	
Shin, Harry	Associated Builders	
Sumchai, Ahimsa Porter	BVHP Health & Environmental Resource Center	
Tisdell, Keith	Resident	
Tompkins, Raymond	BVHP Coalition on the Environment	
Washington, Caroline	Network for Elders	
Wright, Leilani	JRM & Associates	
Regulators		
Brownell, Amy	SF Dept. of Public Health	
Kao, Chein	California Dept. of Toxic Substances	
Lane, Jacqueline Ann	U.S. EPA Region IX	
Forman, Keith	Navy Co-chair, SWDIV	
Menack, Julie	Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Work, Michael	U.S. EPA Region IX	

ATTACHMENT B

25 SEPTEMBER 2003 - RAB MEETING
ACTION ITEMS

Item No.	Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
Carry-Over Items				
1.	Navy to report back to RAB regarding recommendation that air quality samples be collected for all future HPS fires.	October RAB	Navy	
New Items				
2.	Navy to ensure 1998 Basewide Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) available to RAB	ASAP	Navy/ITSI	1996 Basewide EBS is located in Anna Waden Branch Library. Also, Mr. Work said the 1998 Basewide EBS is available for viewing at EPA's office. (415-972-3024)
3.	Navy to place SFRA Lease Agreement Document in Branch Library Information Repository	ASAP	Navy/ITSI	Document placed in Waden Library Info Repository. Also, Lease Addendum was e-mailed to RAB members on 07 Oct
4.	SRFA to provide Marie Harrison with a copy of the Lease Agreement Document	ASAP	SFRA - Don Capobres	Mailed to Ms. Harrison on 26 Sept 03
5.	Health Dept to report back on question of weed abatement on city property adjacent to Shipyard	October RAB	SF Dept of Public Health- Amy Brownell	

Item No.	Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
6.	Navy to contact SF Dept of Public Works about including the perimeter of the Shipyard in their patrol for unauthorized disposal of household goods, etc.	None specified	Navy – Keith Forman	

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

Multi-Page™

Meeting of October 23, 2003
Reporter's Transcript

1
2
3
4
5
6 HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
7 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
8
9
10 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING
11
12 October 23, 2003
13
14 Dago Mary's Restaurant
15 Hunters Point Shipyard, Building 916
16 Donahue Street at Hudson Avenue
17 San Francisco, California
18
19 Reported by Christine M. Niccoli, RPR, C.S.R. No. 4569
20 -----
21 NICCOLI REPORTING
22 619 Pilgrim Drive
23 Foster City, CA 94404-1707
24 (650) 573-9339
25 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS SERVING THE BAY AREA

Page 1

1 PARTICIPANTS
2
3 FACILITATOR: MARSHA PENDERGRASS - Pendergrass &
4 Associates
5 CO-CHAIRS: KEITH FORMAN - United States Navy, SWDIV
6 LYNNE BROWN - Communities for a Better
7 Environment (CBE), Community
8 First Coalition (CFC)
9
10
11 RAB MEMBERS
12
13 LANI ASHER - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE),
14 Community First Coalition (CFC)
15 AMY BROWNELL - San Francisco Department of Public Health
16 BARBARA BUSHNELL - R.O.S.E.S., resident
17 MAURICE CAMPBELL - Business Development, Inc. (BDI);
18 Community First Coalition (CFC); New California Media;
19 NEW BAYVIEW NEWSPAPER
20 CHARLES L. DACUS, SR. - Hunters Point resident,
21 R.O.S.E.S.
22 MARIE HARRISON - Communities for a Better Environment
23 (CBE), SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW, Greenaction
24 MITSUYO HASEGAWA - JRM Associates
25 HELEN JACKSON - All Hallows Gardens Residents Association

Page 2

1 RAB MEMBERS [Cont.]:
2
3 CHEIN KAO - California Department of Toxic Substances
4 Control (DTSC)
5 JACQUELINE ANN LANE - U.S. Environmental Protection
6 Agency (EPA)
7 LEA LOIZOS - Arc Ecology
8 KEVYN D. LUTTON - Resident
9 J. R. MANUEL - JRM Associates, India Basin resident
10 JESSE MASON - Community First Coalition (CFC)
11 JULIE MENACK - San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality
12 Control Board
13 JAMES MORRISON - Environmental Technology
14 GEORGIA OLIVA - Communities for a Better Environment
15 (CBE), CCA member
16 KAREN G. PIERCE - Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic
17 Club, BVHP Health & Environmental Assessment Program
18 MELITA RINES - India Basin Neighborhood Association
19 HARRY SHIN - Associated Builders
20 AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI - Bayview-Hunters Point Health &
21 Environmental Resource Center (HERC)
22 KEITH TISDELL - Hunters Point resident
23 RAYMOND TOMPKINS - Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition on
24 the Environment
25 MICHAEL WORK - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Page 3

1 RAB MEMBERS [Cont.]:
2
3 LEILANI WRIGHT - JRM Associates
4 ---oOo---
5
6
7 OTHER ATTENDEES
8
9 ARVIND ACHARYA - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc.
10 (I.T.S.I.)
11 NADINE ANDRAKIN - Katz & Associates
12 RONALD BATISTE - EEC
13 DOUG BIELSKIS - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
14 ANDREW L. BOZEMAN - Southeast Sector Community
15 Development Corporation
16 PATRICK BROOKS - United States Navy
17 VICTORIA COKER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
18 FRANCISCO DA COSTA - Environmental Justice Advocacy
19 STEVE DELHOMME - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
20 REBECCA FOX - Shipyard artist
21 MIGUEL GALARZA - Yerba Buena Engineering & Construction,
22 Inc.
23 BOB HOCKER - Lennar/Bayview-Hunters Point Team
24 CAROLYN HUNTER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
25 FENG JIN - Artist, sculptor

Page 4

1 OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]: 2 3 RONALD WM. KEICHLINE - Innovative Technical Solutions, 4 Inc. (I.T.S.I.) 5 LAFO LAULU - Resident 6 LISA LAULU - Resident 7 LAURA L. LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs 8 Support Office (RASO) 9 RICHARD LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs 10 Support Office (RASO) 11 QUIJUAN MALOOF - Pendergrass & Associates 12 CHARLES R. MAZOWIECKI - United States Navy 13 DEBRA MOORE - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. 14 (I.T.S.I.) 15 REV JOE NIUMALELEGA 16 SEALI'IMALIETO A SAM RIPLEY - Samoan American Media 17 Services 18 DENNIS M. ROBINSON - Shaw Environmental & 19 Infrastructure, Inc. 20 LEE H. SAUNDERS - United States Navy 21 IVAN SEPULOVA 22 MATTHEW L. SHAPS, ESQ. - Paul Hastings LLP for Lennar 23 CLIFTON J. SMITH - C.J. Smith & Associates, Eagle 24 Environmental Construction 25 MIYA STANOFF - Hunters Point Shipyard Building 366 Page 5	1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2003 2 5:59 P.M. 3 ---oOo--- 4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Welcome, everyone, to the 5 Thursday, the 23rd of October, Hunters Point Shipyard 6 Restoration Advisory Board meeting. 7 Everybody in the right place? 8 MR. FORMAN: Let's go. 9 MR. DACUS: We getting there. 10 MR. FORMAN: He's right. 11 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Got to remind 12 everybody to turn your cell phones off; remember to 13 remove your pagers. Turn them off as well. 14 Okay. As is normal and is our custom, tonight 15 let's all introduce ourselves, and let's start with the 16 RAB members, and we're going to start with Ron tonight. 17 MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald Keichline, I.T.S.I. 18 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir. 19 MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, CFC, Community 20 First Coalition. 21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. 22 Yes, sir. 23 MR. MASON: Jesse Mason, Community First 24 Coalition. 25 MS. OLIVA: Georgia Oliva, Shipyard artist. Page 6
1 OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]: 2 3 PETER STROGANOFF - United States Navy ROICC Office 4 DAVID TERZIAN - The Point 5 ALLISON TURNER - Katz & Associates 6 RENEE UNDERWOOD - Ideal Day Care 7 JULIA VETROMILE - Tetra Tech EM Inc. 8 JASON WEBSTER - Shipyard artist 9 PETER WILSEY - San Francisco Department of Public Health 10 ---oOo--- Page 6	1 MS. BROWNELL: Amy Brownell, San Francisco 2 Health Department. 3 MR. BROWN: Lynne Brown, Community First 4 Coalition. 5 MR. FORMAN: Keith Forman, Navy BRAC 6 Environmental Coordinator. 7 MR. BROOKS: Pat Brooks, the lead Remedial 8 Project Manager for the Navy. 9 MS. WRIGHT: Leilani Wright, RAB member. 10 MR. WORK: Michael Work, U.S. EPA. 11 MR. DACUS: Charles L. Dacus, Sr., ROSES, and 12 I'm affiliated with RAB. 13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. 14 MR. KAO: Chein Kao, State Department of Toxic 15 Substances Control. 16 MS. MENACK: Julie Menack, Regional Water 17 Quality Control Board. 18 MR. TISDELL: Keith Tisdell, resident, RAB 19 member. 20 MS. RINES: Melita Rines, India Basin 21 Neighborhood Association, RAB member. 22 MR. MALOOF: Quijuan Maloof, Pendergrass & 23 Associates. 24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. One other RAB member. 25 MS. HASEGAWA: Mitsuyo Hasegawa, RAB member. Page 8

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you get that?
2 (The reporter nods.)
3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
4 Now we're going to introduce everyone else in
5 the room tonight. And what I'm going to do tonight to
6 facilitate a little quicker introductions, I'm going to
7 pass the microphone to each person; and if you can
8 clearly speak your name so that we can record it, would
9 be really great.
10 So we'll start with you.
11 MR. ROBINSON: Dennis Robinson, Shaw
12 Environmental.
13 MS. ANDRAKIN: Nadine Andrakin, Katz &
14 Associates.
15 MS. TURNER: Allison Turner, Katz & Associates.
16 MR. WEBSTER: Jason Webster, tenant, 366,
17 resident, Hunters Point.
18 MR. GALARZA: Miguel Galarza, Yerba Buena
19 Engineering.
20 MR. STROGANOFF: Peter Stroganoff, ROICC Navy
21 office.
22 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Charles Mazowiecki, Navy RPM.
23 MS. HUNTER: Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech.
24 MS. LANE: Jackie Lane, EPA community
25 development.

Page 9

1 MS. FOX: Rebecca Fox, tenant, Building 366.
2 MS. STANOFF: Miya Stanoff, Building 366.
3 MR. DELHOMME: Steve Delhomme, Tetra Tech.
4 MS. COKER: Victoria Coker with Tetra Tech.
5 MS. LOWMAN: Laurie Lowman with the Navy
6 Radiological Affairs Support Office.
7 MR. LOWMAN: Dick Lowman with the same outfit.
8 MR. HOCKER: Bob Hocker, Lennar BVHP.
9 MR. ACHARYA: Arvind Acharya, I.T.S.I.
10 MS. VETROMILE: Julia Vetromile, Tetra Tech.
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. We got a couple of new
12 RAB members join us. Marie?
13 MS. HARRISON: Marie Harrison.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. And . . .
15 MS. BUSHNELL: Barbara Bushnell, RAB member.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.
17 MR. TOMPKINS: Raymond Tompkins, board member.
18 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you. Well,
19 that seemed to go pretty well. All right.
20 Let's look at the agenda tonight. Any
21 suggestions, changes, comments on the agenda tonight?
22 We have a pretty tight agenda in that we have a
23 couple of really crucial presentations tonight. So
24 we're going to try to, as always, keep things as
25 succinct as possible.

Page 10

1 But before we move any further along, let's
2 review the action items and make sure that all of those
3 have been cleared up and forward on.
4 The first one I show is the Navy was to report
5 back to the RAB regarding recommendation that
6 air-quality samples be collected for all future Hunters
7 Point Shipyard fires. The person on that was the Navy.
8 MR. FORMAN: Right.
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: And the resolution
10 status . . . ?
11 MR. FORMAN: Okay.
12 MR. BROOKS: We were discussing that with the
13 Risk & Technical Subcommittee, and we're still
14 evaluating that. So push that item on for next --
15 report back on the next meeting.
16 MR. FORMAN: Yeah. I think we made some good
17 progress. We had a good dialogue with Mr. Ray Tompkins
18 and Miss Karen Pierce and with the chief of the federal
19 fire department. But it's going to take some looking
20 into, some more in-depth stuff.
21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I need a little bit
22 more concreteness to move this -- to carry this on.
23 So what's being carried forward? You're going
24 to report back to the RAB at another time on this issue
25 or --?

Page 11

1 MR. BROOKS: At the December meeting.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: At the December meeting.
3 Thank you so much. So this will carry over to the
4 December meeting.
5 New items for action are the Navy to ensure
6 1998 Basewide Environmental Baseline Survey available to
7 the RAB. That was to be done as soon as possible.
8 And to my knowledge, has that happened?
9 MR. FORMAN: Mr. Keichline?
10 MR. KEICHLINE: There is a 1996 version in the
11 library. The 1998 version specifically mentioned during
12 the RAB meeting is not in there. It's been requested
13 from the contractor to make multiple additional copies
14 and get those sent off to the library as soon as
15 possible.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Will you alert --
17 alert us on that task when that's in the library?
18 MR. KEICHLINE: Yeah, I'll do my best as long
19 as I get word from Diane Silva, sure.
20 MR. BROOKS: In the meantime, Michael Work from
21 U.S. EPA said he has a copy in their office; and if
22 someone is anxious to review that, it's available.
23 MR. FORMAN: As a footnote to that, I just want
24 to add that Ron Keichline and I and Pat Brooks have been
25 talking, and an additional initiative we're going to do

Page 12

1 is: We're doing a top-to-bottom review of what's in the
2 info repository at the Anna Waden Library, and I'm going
3 to be taking out some of the volumes that are there that
4 never get read and some that are old, and then we're
5 going to put in some more.

6 We are going to beef up the recent document
7 part of that info repository that includes the recent
8 action memos and the recent tech memos, because I think
9 that's going to be a lot more valuable to you. And
10 we're also including -- ensuring that we have a copy of
11 the Parcel B ROD as well and the five-year review.

12 So look in the next few weeks. Ron and I
13 specifically are going to go over that, and we'll make
14 sure that it's a much -- a more user-friendly info
15 repository.

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there a possibility to get
17 that on line, all of that on the Web site, or not?

18 MR. BROOKS: It's prior to actually having
19 those documents electronically available back in --

20 MS. PENDERGRASS: So they could be scanned in?

21 MR. BROOKS: They can be, but they are not
22 readily available.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

24 All right. So that one will be removed.

25 Action Item 2 will be removed. It has been satisfied.

Page 13

1 Item 3 is the Navy to replace the San Francisco
2 Redevelopment Agency's lease agreement document -- or to
3 place it -- document in the branch library information
4 repository.

5 Has that also been done?

6 MR. KEICHLINE: Yes, it's there.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Any other comments on
8 that?

9 Action Item 4, the San Francisco
10 Redevelopment --

11 What's the "SRFA"?

12 MR. FORMAN: San Francisco Redevelopment
13 Agency.

14 MR. KEICHLINE: That was a typo.

15 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I'm trying to figure
16 that one out.

17 Okay. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
18 to provide Marie Harrison with a copy of the lease
19 agreement document.

20 Miss Harrison, did you receive that?

21 MS. HARRISON: No.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. It said it was mailed
23 to you on the 26th of September.

24 MS. HARRISON: Where did they mail it to?

25 MR. KEICHLINE: I got word from Mr. Capobres

Page 14

1 that it was mailed out, e-mailed me and let me know that
2 it was sent out. So I don't know if there's a problem
3 with the mail or not.

4 MS. HARRISON: He could have mailed it to the
5 Bayview office at which point I'll stop by and get it,
6 or it should have been mailed to my office downtown.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: So Mr. Keichline, will you
8 follow up on that to make sure that she has that?

9 MS. HARRISON: If it's been mailed to the
10 Bayview office, that's fine. I'll just stop by and pick
11 it up. And that should have been mailed to 4908 Third
12 Street.

13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, at this -- at this
14 point, Miss Harrison, if you have not received it and it
15 has been mailed to you, we're going to leave it on,
16 then, as carryover item until you've received it. All
17 right?

18 MS. HARRISON: Very good.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Action Item No. 5: Health
20 Department to report back on questions of weed abatement
21 on city property adjacent to the Shipyards.

22 MS. BROWNELL: I gave some phone numbers to Pat
23 that the Navy can call, and I can also assist them
24 with -- there is an office called the Public Services
25 and Complaint Program at the environmental health

Page 15

1 section of the Health Department where I work that deals
2 with these kinds of issues, and they can put pressure on
3 property owners under the nuisance section of the San
4 Francisco Health Code for overgrown weeds and garbage
5 and abandoned vehicles and things like that. So Pat and
6 Keith are going to pursue that.

7 And I just -- as a follow-up, if anybody else
8 would -- if you'd like to complain, there's a good phone
9 number about any of these kinds of issues: garbage,
10 weeds --

11 MR. TOMPKINS: I want one.

12 MS. BROWNELL: -- and all that. I have several
13 of these brochures. I can give it to anybody. I'll
14 leave a couple on the back table.

15 The phone number is -- There's two phone
16 numbers: 252-3805 is a recorder where if you leave a
17 message, an inspector will get back to you within two to
18 three days; or if you really, really want to talk to a
19 live person, you call 252-3800 and go through all the
20 menus until you get to a live person.

21 MR. BROWN: May I say something?

22 MS. BROWNELL: Sure.

23 MR. BROWN: Why is the Navy doing that when
24 it's on the city property?

25 MS. BROWNELL: It's not -- it's not a city

Page 16

1 property. It's -- There is some private ownership.
2 There's some state property.

3 And I'm going to work with -- but honestly, if
4 the first initial calls come from the Navy, I think they
5 are going to get a lot better response.

6 MR. FORMAN: Than we do on other things? Oh,
7 okay.

8 MS. BROWNELL: We'll definitely work with them.
9 And you're right, if it is city property, we can also
10 enforce just as well. But a lot of the things that they
11 are talking about, especially along that Parcel E fence,
12 it's private property.

13 MR. BROWN: And a lot -- right there on Griffin
14 [sic] Street is city property. So that's where the fire
15 started.

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

17 MR. FORMAN: Okay. So we'll work -- we'll
18 work --

19 MS. BROWNELL: We'll work on it.

20 MR. FORMAN: -- and try and elevate this so
21 that we get some response. But more than getting a
22 response that we get, that we actually get the abatement
23 done. I mean, that's the bottom line.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

25 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

Page 17

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: So with that, Action Item
2 No. 5 will be removed from the list as well.

3 MR. FORMAN: Can I add one quick thing?

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Certainly.

5 MR. FORMAN: Okay. You'll hear more about
6 this. Don't want to go into too much detail tonight
7 because we've got a lot to talk about.

8 But what the Navy is very close to doing -- and
9 we'll report on this more next RAB meeting -- is: We
10 have gone to Goats R Us, and we are going to include
11 Hunters Point as one of the bases in the Bay Area that
12 uses goats from Goats R Us, and more details will be
13 provided later. It's going to take a little time to set
14 it up.

15 But other -- the other BRAC bases use that, and
16 we're looking into it, and it looks like it's going to
17 be a good deal for the community and for the goats,
18 since there's a lot to eat.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Excellent. Excellent.
20 Natural weed abatement approach.

21 All right. Action Item No. 6 is: The Navy is
22 to contact the San Francisco Department of Public Works
23 about including the perimeter of the Shipyard in their
24 patrol for unauthorized disposal -- disposal of
25 household goods.

Page 18

1 Mr. Forman, is that also in your realm of weed
2 abatement?

3 MR. FORMAN: Yes. And that goes hand in
4 hand --

5 MS. BROWNELL: I think that's an issue in the
6 same thing.

7 MR. FORMAN: Yeah. We'll work with Amy
8 Brownell on that.

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Very fine. So Action Item
10 No. 6 is also removed from our list. Thank you.

11 All right. Let's move on with our agenda now.
12 Right now we need to approve the minutes. Everybody has
13 been in receipt of the September 25th minutes, reviewed
14 them? Any comments about them?

15 Yes, sir.

16 MR. CAMPBELL: On page 3 of -- 3 of 10, line
17 No. 18, it states that I said at the previous RAB
18 meeting "Navy responded that they were unaware that SFPD
19 had detonated a device"

20 Part of the question that we had, everybody
21 became aware --

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: A little louder, please.

23 MR. CAMPBELL: What we want to make sure was
24 the timeliness in the future of the future coordination.

25 There wasn't a question whether somebody was going to

Page 19

1 find out about a fire. Eventually everybody would. It
2 was the timeliness. So it should reflect that.

3 MR. KEICHLINE: How -- how --

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: I think on --

5 MR. KEICHLINE: -- is that --?

6 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- on line 22, Mr. Campbell,
7 where it says it was about some time after the incident
8 occurred, however, before you became aware of it. You
9 restated his request that information be directed to
10 Mr. Forman. Has that not covered that?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: No, it doesn't.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: How would you like that
13 rephrased?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'd like it rephrased so
15 there is a time frame, like if something does take
16 place, within 8 hours or 24 hours maximum.

17 MS. PENDERGRASS: These are the minutes of what
18 transpired. So what --

19 MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

20 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- did you say about that at
21 that time?

22 MR. CAMPBELL: The question was timeliness,
23 TIME-LI-NESS. Okay?

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Keichline, do you have
25 enough information to --?

Page 20

1 MR. KEICHLINE: No. I don't understand how
2 that needs to be revised.
3 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. "... some time after
4 the incident occurred, however, before he became aware
5 of it." We were discussing timeliness on updates of the
6 information, and that was the main point, and that's not
7 reflected, the timeliness.
8 We can go back to the transcript and find out.
9 That's one.
10 Two, it talks about the Economic Committee
11 meeting being on 11/17. I'm sorry. 10/17. The
12 Economic Committee meeting was on 10/7. So that needs
13 to be corrected.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
15 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.
17 Mr. Keichline, will you follow up to make sure
18 the -- and review the --?
19 MR. KEICHLINE: Yeah. I'll get with
20 Mr. Campbell during the break --
21 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Very fine.
22 MR. KEICHLINE: -- and make sure that we agree
23 on the language for that.
24 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Do we have a
25 motion to move the minutes as amended?

Page 21

1 MR. BROWN: I make a motion as amended.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: As amended.
3 MR. TISDELL: Second.
4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Second? All right,
5 Mr. Tisdell.
6 Any other discussion on the minutes?
7 All in favor --
8 THE BOARD: Aye.
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- of accepting these
10 minutes, say, "Aye."
11 THE BOARD: Aye.
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?
13 Any abstentions?
14 MR. TOMPKINS: One.
15 MS. PENDERGRASS: One abstention. I'm sorry.
16 All right. Very fine. We have approved those
17 minutes and the action items. All right.
18 All right. Mr. Forman, you have some
19 announcements?
20 MR. FORMAN: Yes. I have some quick Navy
21 announcements so that we can get to our two
22 presentations tonight.
23 First of all, we're coming up on the community
24 information fair that Lynne Brown and I have talked
25 about, and I want you to please attend. And -- and

Page 22

1 equally as important, spread the word out for the
2 information fair. We're putting a lot of work into
3 this, and I think it's going to be the perfect forum for
4 you to come and ask questions of the people who are
5 doing the work at Hunters Point and that are most
6 involved.
7 The details are this: It's November 15th.
8 We'll write it up later on -- on the paper. It's
9 Saturday, November 15th, at the E. P. Mills facility
10 from 10:00 to 3:00. Okay?
11 There'll be -- The San Francisco Redevelopment
12 Agency will be there. Regulators and their represe- --
13 or their representatives will be there, and the Navy
14 will be there with project managers; and we'll be able
15 to discuss each of the programs ongoing at Hunters
16 Point. Parcels E through F will be represented.
17 Laurie Lowman has graciously agreed to fly
18 across the country and -- to be there for you all day to
19 talk about radiological issues. So it's going to be
20 well worth your time to come and engage with us in
21 discussion and learn a lot more about the nitty-gritty
22 details of what's going on at Hunters Point. Okay.
23 Second thing --
24 MR. TOMPKINS: Keith, point of clarification.
25 MR. FORMAN: Yes.

Page 23

1 MR. TOMPKINS: Is this previously the meeting
2 that was scheduled for the 5th has now been moved to the
3 15th?
4 MR. FORMAN: This is an information fair.
5 MR. TOMPKINS: Diff --? Two different
6 meetings?
7 MR. FORMAN: Completely different than the --
8 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.
9 MR. FORMAN: -- November 5th meeting that you
10 and I are going to attend, yes.
11 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.
12 MR. FORMAN: Okay.
13 All right. Second big item: Please, your
14 attention to the back there. As of Tuesday, I have a
15 new e-mail address, and this is one of the few things in
16 the world that's not getting more complex. It's
17 actually getting simpler. You notice that it's
18 Keith.Forman@navy.mil, a lot easier. Now, I also have a
19 new phone number, so copy that down, 415-308-1458.
20 Okay. Item No. 3, I want everybody to read a
21 copy of that. We put a lot of work into these, and
22 remember, I promised you fact sheets that give you the
23 details and -- of what we're doing.
24 Fact Sheet No. 4. Radiological Fact Sheet
25 No. 4 is out tonight. You're the first ones to see it,

Page 24

1 and it's at the table. I hope that everybody gets a
2 copy and reads it tonight.
3 Fact Sheet No. 4 focuses on the project that
4 Ryan Ahlersmeyer talked to you about two months ago at
5 Installation Restoration Site No. 2 and the concentrated
6 area where there were radium dials disposed of. That
7 project is highlighted in our next fact sheet.
8 Okay. That's all I've got.
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.
10 MR. BROWN: I've got a question.
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.
12 MR. BROWN: If I'm not mistaken, the CAC has a
13 workshop on the DDA the same day.
14 MR. ATTENDEE: That's right.
15 MR. FORMAN: Same day as what?
16 MR. BROWN: Same day as our information fair.
17 MR. FORMAN: Really?
18 MS. PENDERGRASS: Is it the same time?
19 MR. BROWN: What time? Ten o'clock?
20 MR. CAMPBELL: It will probably be from about
21 10:00 to 11:00.
22 MR. ATTENDEE: 10:00 to 3:00.
23 MR. CAMPBELL: 10:00 to 3:00.
24 MS. PENDERGRASS: That sounds like you got to
25 make some choices.

Page 25

1 MR. FORMAN: That's right.
2 MR. BROWN: Day time -- day time is DDA. But I
3 don't know about that.
4 MR. FORMAN: Well, it's been well known for
5 quite some time that -- you know?
6 MR. ATTENDEE: You --
7 MR. FORMAN: You know?
8 MR. ATTENDEE: I know.
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tisdell?
10 MR. TISDELL: It's -- it's really -- it's
11 really to be like a conflict wherever the RAB has
12 something set up, and the people who we expecting be
13 always off at another meeting, you know. And, like, is
14 it -- it's -- you know, I think the Navy might -- well,
15 it's going to be a problem.
16 And one of the things that question that maybe,
17 Keith, you can send to -- to Don Capobres about, you
18 know, trying to -- these different committees being set
19 up and trying to, you know, like when you give us
20 something, they are giving something that conflicted
21 that's equally as important --
22 MR. FORMAN: Well, I --
23 MR. TISDELL: -- you know, and --
24 MR. FORMAN: I agree with you, and you know he
25 was here. You know that I've told Mr. Capobres about

Page 26

1 the date, and I kept him on track. For several
2 different reasons I kept him in the loop. I'm also
3 asking him for things too --
4 MR. TISDELL: Yeah.
5 MR. FORMAN: -- including information, phone
6 boards, a booth, all that kind of thing. So --
7 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. So we need to
8 move on from this issue. I mean, at this point, it's
9 done.
10 Yes, ma'am.
11 MS. SUMCHAI: Just a quick comment. I think
12 one of the reasons why the bylaws indicate that the
13 membership should include a CAC representative is to
14 cross-pollinate the two organizations and to facilitate
15 communication. But clearly, we shouldn't be having
16 major events that, you know, conflict like this.
17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
18 MR. FORMAN: Our event is one of a kind. Is
19 this a one-of-a-kind event? I understand there's
20 this --
21 MS. LUTTON: It's a finalizing --
22 MR. BROWN: They are rushing through the DDA.
23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, I'm sorry, but at this
24 point, we need to end this discussion. And the only
25 option at this point is for Mr. Brown and Mr. Forman, if

Page 27

1 you all feel that you can have a conversation with
2 someone at CAC, you all need to take that off line,
3 okay?
4 MR. FORMAN: Okay.
5 MS. PENDERGRASS: If you need to have a
6 consult.
7 MR. FORMAN: Absolutely. I agree with you.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We need to
9 move --
10 MR. TISDELL: I don't.
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry?
12 Mr. Brown, your report?
13 MR. BROWN: I already made it.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. And before we
15 move forward, is there any -- outside of our
16 subcommittee reports, is there anything like that, any
17 announcements that need to be made right now?
18 All right. Very fine. Let's move on to the
19 landfill gas --
20 I'm sorry. I didn't -- I didn't see your hand.
21 Mr. Tisdell.
22 MR. TISDELL: I have a question to Keith
23 Forman.
24 MS. PENDERGRASS: This is the time for
25 announcements if you have a --

Page 28

<p>1 MR. TISDELL: It is -- it . . .</p> <p>2 Go ahead and play your game.</p> <p>3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. Thank you.</p> <p>4 Mr. Mazowiecki, are you ready to --</p> <p>5 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes, I am.</p> <p>6 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- your report?</p> <p>7 MR. MAZOWIECKI: This is going to be an update</p> <p>8 on the landfill gas removal action that we have been</p> <p>9 doing for several months now. There's been a lot of</p> <p>10 questions that have come up, and I think we'd like to</p> <p>11 clarify the situation, and it's going to involve going</p> <p>12 through a review of a lot of material that some of you</p> <p>13 have seen before. It may be new material to some</p> <p>14 others.</p> <p>15 I'm going to cover the landfill gas removal</p> <p>16 action, discuss briefly the gas control system that was</p> <p>17 installed, the levels of methane that we found with our</p> <p>18 monitoring system and some repair work that involved</p> <p>19 grouting in the barrier wall. Recently we discovered</p> <p>20 some methane at GMP 24 and discuss that and what we're</p> <p>21 going to be doing in the future.</p> <p>22 Initially back in April of 2002, we discovered</p> <p>23 the full extent of the methane. That's the whole purple</p> <p>24 area. You can see that it goes nearly to the edge of</p> <p>25 the U.C.S.F. property real close to Crisp Avenue. That,</p> <p>Page 29</p>	<p>1 swale that runs along the property line right here, and</p> <p>2 it never made it to the drainage swale.</p> <p>3 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. And how far does it</p> <p>4 extend to the bottom? Because the slide's cut off</p> <p>5 there.</p> <p>6 MR. MAZOWIECKI: The methane probably was</p> <p>7 corresponding to -- you can see the cap over here, and</p> <p>8 it didn't go much beyond the edge of the cap</p> <p>9 [indicating].</p> <p>10 MR. BIELSKIS: There's another map</p> <p>11 [indicating].</p> <p>12 MR. MAZOWIECKI: There's a map on the poster</p> <p>13 board over there that show the edge of the cap. It</p> <p>14 doesn't show the methane -- expansion of methane.</p> <p>15 MR. TOMPKINS: But the methane does go off</p> <p>16 beyond the cap?</p> <p>17 MR. MAZOWIECKI: It does go beyond the cap,</p> <p>18 yeah. The cap got it covered, and it started going</p> <p>19 under the cap to escape.</p> <p>20 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.</p> <p>21 MR. MAZOWIECKI: The removal action that we</p> <p>22 prepared and then later implemented it had as its goal</p> <p>23 to remove the methane discovered beneath the University</p> <p>24 of California-San Francisco, U.C.S.F., compound and to</p> <p>25 maintain a regulatory limit of less than 5 percent</p> <p>Page</p>
<p>1 of course, caused some concern on our part because the</p> <p>2 methane levels on the U.C.S.F. compound were above the</p> <p>3 lower explosive limit. We wanted to make sure that we</p> <p>4 could correct that situation, and we want to prevent</p> <p>5 further migration onto Crisp Avenue.</p> <p>6 MR. TOMPKINS: Excuse me. Could you go back to</p> <p>7 the slide real quick? I'm trying to follow here. I</p> <p>8 apologize.</p> <p>9 On the form, how far -- since the slide cuts</p> <p>10 off, how far does the plume go, the methane plume, if I</p> <p>11 understood you --</p> <p>12 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Are you --?</p> <p>13 MR. TOMPKINS: -- correctly --</p> <p>14 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Are you --?</p> <p>15 MR. TOMPKINS: -- to the left?</p> <p>16 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Are you speaking right there?</p> <p>17 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, sir.</p> <p>18 MR. MAZOWIECKI: That's just about at the edge.</p> <p>19 It doesn't extend out at all. It's just kind of around</p> <p>20 the edge.</p> <p>21 MS. HARRISON: That's not at the edge?</p> <p>22 MR. TOMPKINS: Is that -- private property, is</p> <p>23 that going --?</p> <p>24 MR. MAZOWIECKI: That didn't go onto private</p> <p>25 property. It remained on Parcel E. There's a drainage</p> <p>Page 30</p>	<p>1 within the U.C.S.F. compound.</p> <p>2 The part of the removal action activities and</p> <p>3 the determination of success were: We wanted to operate</p> <p>4 the extraction wells, and we wanted to take the methane</p> <p>5 down to less than a half a percent at the extraction</p> <p>6 wells. We have got some gas-monitoring probes, or GMPs,</p> <p>7 and we want to maintain those at less than 1 percent</p> <p>8 methane during the active extraction phase.</p> <p>9 We then move into weekly monitoring, and we</p> <p>10 kept the extraction wells in that phase at less than</p> <p>11 1 percent, and at U.C.S.F. GMPs less than 2 percent</p> <p>12 methane.</p> <p>13 The reason that we were keeping these levels</p> <p>14 that low is: We wanted it to extract -- there was a</p> <p>15 real possibility of what we call rebound where the</p> <p>16 methane would reappear, and we wanted to make sure that</p> <p>17 even if we had a rebound, that eventually we would be</p> <p>18 below the 5 percent methane, which was our -- the goal</p> <p>19 of the removal action.</p> <p>20 And the last bullet says that we describe</p> <p>21 successful completion and start monitoring if we had</p> <p>22 four months below 5 percent methane.</p> <p>23 This is the system that was constructed. The</p> <p>24 line shown in purple is our trench with the high-density</p> <p>25 polyethylene sheathing in it.</p> <p>Page 32</p>

1 And we've got a number of extraction wells.
2 Nine of them are on the U.C.S.F. property. We've got
3 one just off their property on -- within the railroad
4 lease.
5 We have got some seven GMPs along Crisp Avenue.
6 We have got a number of GMPs along the barrier wall
7 itself, and there are also some GMPs on the U.C.S.F.
8 compound. We have got some GMPs that extend past the
9 barrier over here [indicating].
10 After we installed the system and operated it,
11 this was the situation that resulted. You can see now
12 that we pulled the methane -- I'm sorry. This is still
13 April of 2002. This was the situation. And then after
14 we operated the system, we pulled it back. So you can
15 see that there's been a significant change.
16 The methane on this side is such that we still
17 have methane here [indicating], so I can't call that the
18 zero-methane line anymore. There's methane. This is
19 still an active landfill. Because of the barrier,
20 that's where the methane ends.
21 MS. HARRISON: This is a plastic barrier?
22 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes. It's about -- It's
23 high-density polyethylene. It's plastic. It's about a
24 16th of an inch thick.
25 This shows us the results of some monitoring
Page 33

1 that we did along the fence line GMPs. These are --
2 these are the numbers over here [indicating], each one.
3 Sometimes you'll see two sets of numbers, for example,
4 G.O. -- GMP 01 and 01A. When we constructed the
5 barrier, some of those GMPs were destroyed and had to be
6 replaced. The replacement GMP is the one with the "A"
7 suffix on it.
8 This shows the methane levels [indicating]
9 before we did the extraction. When we went to active
10 extraction, and you can see the dramatic decrease in the
11 methane concentrations. And we had to do a little bit
12 of extraction from our passive vents, but we kept the
13 methane levels down.
14 And as of May 27th, the removal action was
15 termed completed, and we are in the process of writing
16 our closeout report now. That's going to document all
17 of the activities that were undertaken to get us to that
18 point.
19 MS. HARRISON: Excuse me. Before you move on,
20 5 and 6B, those are also replacements?
21 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes. Sometimes the "A" had to
22 be replaced with "B."
23 MS. HARRISON: So that's a --
24 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes.
25 MS. HARRISON: -- the third-time-around
Page 34

1 replacement?
2 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm sorry?
3 MS. HARRISON: "B" would be a third time
4 around?
5 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes, which we didn't go up
6 away from. We continued to do some monitoring, and we
7 found out that there was still some methane passing
8 through the barrier, although it seemed to occur at the
9 locations west of GMP 03A. We grouted sections west of
10 GMP 03A to limit communication across the barrier wall.
11 And we also installed some turbines on the
12 passive vents. We inspected a bentonite cover that we
13 have on the trench. We looked at our pollution-control
14 filters to make sure they were functioning properly, and
15 we measured the gas flow rates throughout our extraction
16 system and throughout the entire control system.
17 The grouted areas, you can see over here, are
18 shown in a light-blue line. I -- To my eyes, they are
19 a little difficult to read, but there's one section
20 there. There's another section there, there --
21 MR. TOMPKINS: Not just your eyes.
22 MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- and another section over
23 there. I'm hoping that it shows up a little better on
24 the handout.
25 MR. TOMPKINS: No.
Page 35

1 MS. BROWNELL: It's worse.
2 MR. TOMPKINS: So it's not just your eyes.
3 MR. MAZOWIECKI: After we did the grouting, we
4 continued our monitoring program. The results showed
5 that the grouting and maintenance activities had been
6 effective; but we wanted to tweak the system a little
7 bit more, and we then decided to grout the areas that
8 were left ungrouted all to the west of GMP 03A, and that
9 was done. So we now have grouting across this whole
10 section over here [indicating].
11 The grouting --
12 MS. ASHER: What kind of material is the grout?
13 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I was just going to touch on
14 that.
15 MS. ASHER: Okay.
16 MR. MAZOWIECKI: The grout is a mixture of
17 water, clay, and cement; and the exact proportions vary
18 according to what the contractor feels is required at
19 that particular time.
20 It was pumped to the bottom of the trench, and
21 they would measure their pumping pressure, and they also
22 had some monitoring points that they could visually look
23 down to the bottom of the trench and see if a grout had
24 reached those points; and as the grout did and as
25 pressure would build up, they then raised the injection
Page 36

1 pipe a foot at a time.

2 So they grouted from the bottom of the trench,
3 which is 17 feet deep, down to the bottom of the
4 bentonite, which is roughly 3 to 4 feet below the ground
5 surface.

6 The slurry mixture is intended to both
7 reinforce the back of the barrier wall, and it would
8 also have a tendency to flow into any crevices, nooks,
9 and crannies that it would cover, and it would tend to
10 fill in any possible punctures in the plastic lining.

11 MS. HARRISON: I have a question. It might be
12 a dumb question; but these gases, are they pretty much
13 like water? Eventually they find themselves a way out?

14 Anything, to me, that's mixed with water in it
15 eventually breaks down, and water will find a way
16 through plastic. I don't care how thick it is. It will
17 find its way through it.

18 Are these -- these gases more denser than the
19 water, or do they find their way through?

20 MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. The gas could also
21 permeate through the plastic. The barrier itself and
22 the grout behind it are intended to make the flow of the
23 gas very slow.

24 I skimmed through a part of the construction;
25 but on the landfill side of the barrier, we have a pipe

Page 37

1 that runs the full length of the barrier. That pipe is
2 imbedded in gravel, and it's intended to intercept the
3 methane that may be on that side of the trench and then
4 vent that to the atmosphere through the
5 pollution-control filters again.

6 The vent is much easier for the methane to flow
7 through than the -- than the plastic and the gravel. So
8 it provides a preferential pathway for the methane. But
9 no, there is no such thing as a totally impermeable
10 membrane and --

11 MS. HARRISON: Okay. Do you have the same
12 process on the edge of the -- along the -- the water
13 line?

14 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Well, the plastic extends to
15 approximately 2 feet below the water line in that area.
16 Methane is insoluble in water, and it would not flow
17 down below the barrier. The barrier is 2 feet into the
18 water table.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Can you hold the rest of the
20 questions until the end of your presentation?

21 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Okay.

22 If you hold your questions until we get to the
23 end, I guess we will move along a little quicker. If we
24 don't answer any -- any questions that you have now,
25 I'll be here at the end of the meeting, and I'll be

Page 38

1 certainly glad to answer any questions. I've got some
2 people from our consulting firm over here, and we should
3 be able to answer the questions that you have.

4 And now looking here on this slide at GMP 24,
5 and I just want to show you exactly where that is. It's
6 right by the laboratory building on the U.C.S.F.
7 compound.

8 And what -- why that's significant is: Earlier
9 this month we found at GMP 24 this little spike over
10 here. The methane had increased and gone up to
11 4.9 percent. That was cause for concern on our part.

12 We installed a number of temporary monitoring
13 probes, and those are the little green squares that you
14 see all around GMP 24, which is the big green circle.

15 Conducted significant amount of monitoring, and
16 what you see here is the result. The interior line
17 represents the 4 percent methane concentration, and the
18 outer line is the methane at a 1 percent concentration.
19 You're looking at that.

20 Our biggest concern, of course, was that the
21 methane might be coming from the trench, and this seems
22 to indicate that it's not, because if it were coming
23 from the trench and going this way, the higher
24 concentration would be here [indicating]. But the
25 highest concentration is in this location [indicating],

Page 39

1 and it actually gets less as you approach the trench.

2 We started extracting from GMP 24 to correct
3 the situation, and this is what we were looking at as of
4 Tuesday's monitoring result. So we have got about a
5 1 percent concentration in that contour. So you can see
6 that it was effective.

7 We are continuing to monitor to see if we can
8 get rid of that last little bit of methane and to see if
9 we have got any answers that we can use to explain just
10 where that methane came from.

11 MS. SUMCHAI: I have to stop you. You said
12 that is by a laboratory. That's a provocative
13 situation, having methane gas, even if it's only
14 4.9 percent, next to a laboratory.

15 MR. MASON: Give her a mike.

16 MR. MAZOWIECKI: It's underground and it's not
17 in the building, and it's been corrected.

18 MS. SUMCHAI: But you don't know where it's
19 coming from?

20 MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. I can't answer that
21 question.

22 MS. SUMCHAI: This is really strange.

23 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Our intention now is to
24 continue to monitor. We'll use the extraction blowers
25 that we have, if necessary, to assist the passive vents.

Page 40

<p>1 In December we are going to install six 2 additional GMPs on Crisp Avenue, and in February we are 3 going to submit a working -- a monitoring work plan to 4 the agencies for their review and approval. 5 And now if you've got any questions . . . 6 MS. HARRISON: Yes. 7 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Okay. 8 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We are going to 9 start over here with Mr. Tompkins and move around the 10 table if that's all right with you. 11 MR. TOMPKINS: Two problems. Two-part 12 question. One -- 13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins, will you take 14 the microphone? 15 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. 16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. 17 MR. TOMPKINS: As I understand in talking to 18 some of the technicians and some of the Navy folks, in 19 your experience in handling these type of sites and 20 landfills, normally, as I understand it, that a landfill 21 will quit producing methane gas about in a 30-year 22 range. 23 As I understand it, some of the anecdotal 24 evidence that this place the site's almost 50 years, and 25 the question is -- like Dr. Ahimsa pointed out earlier,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 remains to be generating. 2 MR. TOMPKINS: But in terms of the 3 cost-effectiveness factor, that wouldn't it be in terms 4 of cost effectiveness cheaper for removal of the -- 5 finding the source of removing it rather than putting 6 the pumps and having this constant monitoring over a 7 longer period of time and in terms of safety or risk 8 factor to the community? Because we don't know what's 9 in it, what's coming out -- 10 MR. MAZOWIECKI: When -- 11 MR. TOMPKINS: -- from that. 12 MR. MAZOWIECKI: When you talk about the 13 removal -- I just want to be clear -- what do you wish 14 to remove? The methane or the trash? 15 MR. TOMPKINS: The source that's causing the 16 methane. Methane is the by-product of decomposition. 17 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Correct. 18 MR. TOMPKINS: Therefore, if we don't remove 19 the source, we are always going to have the by-product. 20 And would it not be for cost effectiveness cheaper to 21 remove the source than to do this -- I could classify it 22 as almost a Band-Aid or -- not Band-Aid, but -- 23 What would be the appropriate word? 24 MS. SUMCHAI: A Band-Aid. 25 MR. TOMPKINS: Band-Aid. I mean, in terms of a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 my concern is: Why is it producing this methane after 2 this long time when normal sites usually quit producing 3 this within a 30-year span? We are going on approaching 4 50, and it's still producing this methane. 5 Have any site -- I know the Navy spent billions 6 on site characterization. But we still -- as you kindly 7 pointed out, we still don't know why is this producing. 8 It should be not focused on the source of 9 production of this methane because in my view this is 10 almost like a Band-Aid. Unless you get rid of the 11 cause, you still have the symptoms, and this is a 12 \$13 million approach, and we still haven't resolved 13 issue of where the methane is coming from. 14 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Well, the first question -- or 15 to answer the first part of that question, the 30 year 16 is probably just a rule of thumb. It does not match 17 anything within my experience. I've been digging in 18 landfills, and I can pick up magazines that are 50 years 19 old, and you can still read them. Obviously, they 20 haven't decomposed, and the trash is still decomposing. 21 At Hunters Point, of course, it was 22 unregulated. We don't know exactly what's there. But I 23 don't know that it's that important to know how much 24 longer it's going to go. I just think that we have to 25 be prepared to control the gas for however long it</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 stopgap measure. 2 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Usually -- 3 MR. TOMPKINS: Band-Aid, stopgap measure, so it 4 doesn't blow up. 5 MR. MAZOWIECKI: The only thing that I can say 6 in that regard is: What you're seeing here in this 7 method of methane control is typical of what you will 8 see at a closed landfill. 9 Now, if you're talking about a source removal, 10 this is, you know, very preliminary cost estimates, but 11 it has been looked at, but you're looking at probably a 12 half a billion dollars. 13 Now, you can operate this gas-control system 14 for a very long time with a half-a-billion-dollar 15 budget, and that's the reason that we're looking at a 16 gas-control system rather than trying to go through the 17 landfill and removing any material that might be 18 decomposing. 19 MR. TOMPKINS: I'll defer question so that 20 other colleagues can ask. 21 MR. MASON: That -- that brings me to the 22 question that I'd like to ask you, because it seems like 23 we been working with this -- this barrier for a while, 24 because in the beginning we thought that the barrier was 25 going to basically stop the methane. But -- This is one</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p>

1 of the things that you guys assured us of.

2 But at the same time, my question is: Who's
3 the contractor that's been, you know, doing the -- the
4 extra work outside of I.T.S.I.? I know that was --
5 that -- that originally that was Barren. Who's the
6 contractor doing this work now?

7 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm not sure which work you
8 mean. Everything that we have been doing has been done
9 with either I.T.S.I. or Tetra Tech, our consultants.
10 I.T.S.I. has brought in a subcontractor to do the
11 grouting.

12 MR. MASON: Okay.

13 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I.T.S.I. has been involved
14 with it.

15 MR. MASON: Okay. Now, my other concern is
16 economics. Now, I'm looking at the opportunity for the
17 community to be involved in it. And one of my biggest
18 concerns is: How many from the community was
19 economically involved?

20 How many people from the community participated
21 in this -- in this action? Because it seems like
22 there's a lot of -- great deal of money being spent out
23 there, and how much is going into the community?

24 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I handle the engineering part
25 of it. If you want to discuss the economics, you'll

Page 45

1 runoff pipe of some kind that may have been buried
2 underneath the foundation?

3 And so methane tends to use pipes, abandoned
4 pipes especially, to move through, not only methane, but
5 the other -- other -- serves as transportation for other
6 gases. Have you guys checked in any sense?

7 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Okay. Answering the last part
8 first, the trench was dug down to a depth of 17 feet.
9 In that 17 feet, we did not encounter any pipes that
10 were utilities or anything else.

11 We did encounter one length of pipe. It was
12 way to the west when they installed it. It's beyond the
13 area where we grouted, and that was just one length of
14 pipe. It was not connected to anything else. When we
15 pulled it out, both ends were clean.

16 The shoreline -- let's see if I can . . .
17 [pause].

18 The shoreline in 1968 kind of goes up like this
19 and around, and I think that's Yosemite Slough over
20 there, and it came down like this [indicating], and that
21 was in the 1968 shoreline.

22 There may be something there. When they filled
23 in the bay, they probably didn't remove the vegetation
24 that was on the floor of the bay, and that could be
25 depo -- decomposing right now. That could be a source

Page 46

1 have to address it to someone else.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Mason, if you could hold
3 that question, I think that would be appropriate to be
4 addressed to someone else. Yes. And if your question
5 had already been answered, we'll move along. We have
6 five minutes left for this period. So --

7 MR. TISDELL: That's truly unfair, you know --

8 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much --

9 MR. TISDELL: -- stand over there.

10 MR. CAMPBELL: -- information.

11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

12 MR. CAMPBELL: Maz, it's my understanding that
13 there is some questions back and forth between the
14 designer of this system, which was Tetra Tech and
15 I.T.S.I., which was to blame. And as a matter of fact,
16 it's costing an awful lot of money.

17 My -- my question -- My questions are -- one
18 is: When you start using extraction blowers to assist
19 passive vents, it's no longer a passive system. It's an
20 active system at that particular point. So you're
21 saying in so many words that you're going on the other
22 side where it has been passive is now going to be active
23 extraction over there.

24 The other part of it is: I'm concerned. Where
25 exactly was the shoreline, and could there have been a

Page 46

1 of the methane.

2 But we feel that because we went down to below
3 the water table and the water table cut off any
4 migratory path of the methane, that we isolated that and
5 removed that as a consideration.

6 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So basically, you're
7 saying, then, you're looking at a possible point source
8 of some sort of minor fill that's under there that's
9 generating the methane, or are you saying in fact that
10 the barrier did have breaches and you're not really
11 sure? Because my understanding is: The barrier -- You
12 are getting methane on both sides of the barrier.
13 That's why you went back and grout it. That makes
14 sense.

15 So what are you saying?

16 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm saying that there's
17 probably a very good possibility that there were
18 punctures in the barrier. We installed this barrier
19 right at the edge of the landfill material. Where
20 possible, we excavated and removed that fill material
21 and hauled it off site.

22 But in the area where we have got the problems,
23 there was a lot of concrete. There was some very lar
24 chunks of concrete that were taken out, and there was
25 one that was perhaps 4 feet by 8 feet by 10 feet. Now,

Page 48

1 that's a big piece of concrete. And there was some
2 rebar.
3 When the barrier was installed, there's a
4 possibility that during the backfill operation,
5 something shifted, either a sharp piece of concrete, a
6 rebar, and it could have landed right against the
7 plastic.
8 And, I mean, this is a strong piece of plastic,
9 but it is still plastic, and it is only about a 16th of
10 an inch thick. It's not unreasonable to think that
11 there might have been one or two places where a hole was
12 poked -- punched in it, and that was the reason we went
13 for the grouting.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tisdell?
15 MR. TISDELL: Yes.
16 MS. HARRISON: And then we have questions too.
17 MR. TISDELL: On that picture right there.
18 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'll leave it up.
19 MR. TISDELL: Okay. Here is Yosemite Slough in
20 here, right?
21 MR. FORMAN: No.
22 MR. TISDELL: Where's Yosemite Slough?
23 MR. FORMAN: Further down.
24 MR. ATTENDEE: Way over.
25 MS. ATTENDEE: On the other --

Page 49

1 over to get to it, so they had to pump a lot of water.
2 They built little coffer dams around it and just pumped
3 a lot of water until they saturated that and flooded it.
4 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
5 MS. HARRISON: I -- I think I have two
6 questions. And I'm trying to really understand this,
7 because if I have to explain this to anybody in its
8 simplest form, I would simply say it is not working,
9 period.
10 But this is my problem. All along the
11 outskirts of this -- this area, there's been several
12 fires. And you have increased the density of this
13 plastic, and you put grout in there to stop the gases
14 from flowing. Before you did that, is it possible that
15 though -- the reason we are having fires on private
16 property across the -- that that gas actually extended
17 itself all the way across it into private property?
18 MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. What you have to have for
19 methane to burn is a 5 percent concentration in air, and
20 we just don't have the methane at those levels in that
21 concentration in the areas where the fire were.
22 What you're looking at are methane
23 concentrations below ground. Once it makes it to the
24 ground surface, it dissipates very rapidly, and the
25 concentration just drops down to a point where it won't

Page 51

1 ATTENDEE: Off the page.
2 MR. TOMPKINS: It's off the page.
3 MR. TISDELL: Okay. With the fire that was
4 reported in June, Lynne, remember, with different
5 colored smoke was coming up?
6 MR. BROWN: Yeah.
7 MR. TISDELL: Would that methane right in here
8 have any effect to do with that fire?
9 MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. The fire migrated from
10 off site into an area that didn't really get into our
11 methane area, our methane area ends with the drainage
12 swale that runs along the western side of property E.
13 Those fires were beyond the drainage swale.
14 And what was actually burning there is -- I
15 don't know if you've ever been in that area, but there
16 are blocks of concrete over there, and they have wood
17 bolted to perhaps two sides of those. It looks like
18 it's maybe 4 by 6 or 4 by 8 planks bolted to the
19 concrete.
20 And what had happened is: The brush fire
21 migrated over to that concrete. That wood caught on
22 fire. Some of it was actually laying down, so the
23 concrete is on top of the wood, and it smoldered.
24 And with the equipment that the fire department
25 could get in there, they couldn't roll that concrete

Page 50

1 support combustion.
2 MS. HARRISON: Okay. So my second question is:
3 I don't know how much that you know about the -- the
4 fire that burned in this area for so very long before we
5 actually were notified.
6 MR. MAZOWIECKI: All I know is --
7 MS. HARRISON: Now --
8 MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- what I heard.
9 MS. HARRISON: Okay.
10 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I wasn't here at the time.
11 MS. HARRISON: But it would have been nice if
12 you were because then you'd understand my questioning.
13 At that time and up till now, no one has been
14 able to explain to us where the heat source came from
15 that actually started that fire. They didn't put it
16 out. What they did was: They put tons and tons of
17 dirt, clay and plastic over it. They have gone back and
18 cleaned the top area off and re -- whatever, seeded,
19 rewhatever they did to it on top again.
20 Now, I'm really concerned that this gas popping
21 up in places that you didn't see it before, all this
22 plastic and grout is there; there is, like you say, a
23 possibility that there was a puncture somewhere. It
24 stands to reason to me just using my limited amount of
25 knowledge on this that if there's a heat source down

Page 52

1 there, that no matter how much clay, plastic and dirt
2 you put there and/or concrete --
3 For some reason, San Francisco thinks that the
4 concrete is a cure-all to everything.
5 What happens if that heat source heats up
6 enough under the ground?
7 You didn't -- They didn't find it because they
8 didn't go in there looking for it. Something caused
9 that to start burning, and no one as of yet has been
10 able to give us a solid answer to why that fire
11 occurred, why it burned so long, how long it burned
12 underground before the flames started shooting up out of
13 the ground and was noticed by the community folks.
14 So, I mean, I just pretty much -- is that fire
15 out? Is that heat source removed?
16 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes, the fire is out. The
17 original source, according to the fire department
18 records, was: It was a brush fire. So it started on
19 the surface. It didn't start within the landfill.
20 Now, you're concerned about heat building up.
21 To have a fire, you need heat, fuel, and oxygen; and if
22 any one of those elements is missing, you're not going
23 to have a fire.
24 Part of our --
25 MS. HARRISON: Parcel E has all those sources.

Page 53

1 You got plenty of fuel. You got plenty of air. And the
2 heat source from -- What started the brush fire?
3 Did --?
4 I mean, I heard several different things. You
5 are the first one to say the brush fire started it. So
6 do they know what started the brush fire?
7 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I don't think anyone --
8 (Simultaneous colloquy.)
9 MS. HARRISON: I just wanted you to understand
10 my -- my point.
11 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm trying to answer it. I'm
12 not trying to put you off.
13 What I'm concerned about and I think what
14 you're concerned about is the landfill gas itself
15 burning again.
16 MS. HARRISON: Mm-hmm.
17 MR. MAZOWIECKI: And when I'm saying that you
18 need heat, you're going to need heat in the landfill
19 itself. Now, you will get some heat over there from the
20 natural decomposition.
21 Microbial activity will generate some heat. In
22 some cases, that heat by itself would raise the
23 temperature, and you could get a fire. But you also
24 need oxygen, and there don't [sic] have the oxygen
25 required to support combustion within the landfill

Page 54

1 itself.
2 The cap was intended to prevent oxygen from
3 entering it. We monitor the oxygen levels as part of
4 our monitoring program. We have not shared those
5 results with anyone simply because there's been no cause
6 for concern. The oxygen levels are way below what you
7 would need to support combustion. But we are looking at
8 it; and it's part of, if you will, keep our fingers on
9 the pulse of the system.
10 So that's something that we are looking at. We
11 are -- we are not trying to, you know, make this problem
12 small, or we are aware of the situation, and we are
13 trying to take what we think is appropriate action.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Miss Harrison.
15 MS. HARRISON: Can I finish, please?
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: He answered your question.
17 MS. HARRISON: No, he didn't. My question will
18 be answered if he tells me this.
19 Are you sure that the protective cover that you
20 put -- because water has oxygen in it, okay? Now, that
21 that air is not flowing -- as it goes out, it's not
22 flowing inside there too? There is no source for that
23 air to go inside underneath that cap?
24 MS. SUMCHAI: But it's partially capped.
25 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Can we --? We need

Page 55

1 t -- we need to take a break. When we come back from
2 the break, we'll start with Dr. Sumchai and Miss Asher.
3 And was there anyone else who had a question?
4 Those -- those are the last two questions. So
5 we need to take a ten-minute break. Come back at ten
6 after 7:00, please.
7 (Recess 6:58 p.m. to 7:12 p.m.)
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: The meeting is called back to
9 order. We still have two questions on the floor. We
10 have a question from Dr. Sumchai, and we have a question
11 from Miss Asher.
12 Dr. Sumchai? Thank you. Yes, ma'am.
13 MS. SUMCHAI: I'm going to -- I'm going to try
14 and be as concise as -- as possible, and I -- I
15 certainly will make every effort to refrain from being
16 argumentative.
17 But I do need to refute the statement that the
18 landfill can't be considered a source of combustion
19 because oxygen isn't accessible to it. The -- the
20 landfill, again, is partially capped; and I have
21 expressed concerns to you that there are portions of the
22 landfill, particularly to the southwest, where the --
23 the density of the monitoring probes is less and where
24 I -- I do believe, you know, the landfill can -- can be
25 accessed by -- by air. And you can respond to that.

Page 56

1 The second thing I want to do is: I want to
2 again advance Ahimsa's theory that on August 16th there
3 was a brush fire on the Parcel E landfill, that it
4 continued to smolder, that it ignited the chemical
5 contents of the landfill.

6 By August 24th there are at least two credible
7 observers, including Lynne Brown and a fireman, who
8 observed the smoke having color to it consistent with a
9 chemical fire. That chemical fire increased the
10 decomposition and the chemical processes within the
11 landfill, and that's why the landfill is producing
12 methane gas.

13 If Ahimsa's theory is correct, the landfill
14 could continue to produce methane gas for the next
15 15 years.

16 The next thing I want to say with regard to the
17 presence of methane at Gas Monitoring Probe 24, the
18 barrier wall is 17 feet deep. Because we don't have a
19 sense of the characterization of the landfill, we don't
20 know its depth. We don't know if the barrier wall is
21 impeding the lateral migration of gases beneath the
22 depth of the landfill.

23 We have the landfill is 20 feet deep, and the
24 barrier wall is only 17 feet deep. That means that
25 there is potentially a low pressure area where gases can
Page 57

1 where we detected the methane. It's higher than the
2 17 feet. That's the bottom of the barrier.

3 I want to repeat again that the barrier's
4 2 feet underwater. The methane, or the trash, landfill
5 material -- whatever you choose to call it -- may be
6 deeper than 17 feet, but it's underwater; and the
7 likelihood of the methane traveling horizontally through
8 the water and below the barrier is extremely low.

9 What we have got is a row of what we are
10 calling fence line GMPs, and they are along here
11 [indicating]. We have monitored those, and we are not
12 finding any methane at those locations.

13 In addition to GMP 24, there are five other
14 GMPs on the U.C.S.F. compound. Those we did not detect
15 any methane, and they are on both sides of GMP 24.
16 GMP 24 is not at the end, so it's not something where
17 you can say, "Well, we just didn't extend them far
18 enough, and it's going around the end."

19 Beyond that we have got seven GMPs on Crisp
20 Avenue, and we haven't detected any methane in those
21 GMPs either.

22 The additional GMPs are something that was put
23 in at the regulatory request. We installed those GMPs,
24 and we encountered groundwater at the time that they
25 were installed, and right now the bottoms of those GMPs
Page 59

1 migrate, you know, beneath that depth.

2 So -- so that's another concern that I have,
3 that the landfill was poorly characterized and that
4 there is also going to be potential for the lateral
5 migration of gases.

6 The other issue that I have concerns about is
7 the Navy's statement of confidence about its control of
8 the migration. If you're saying you're going to install
9 six additional gas-monitoring probes by
10 December 2,003rd -- 2003 along Crisp Avenue at the
11 boundary of Parcel A where someone wants to build
12 1,600 houses, you know, I think that we -- we have a
13 problem here, that there is a logistical problem here,
14 and -- and we need to deal with it.

15 So those are some -- some issues that I have.

16 And I guess a question that I have to you is
17 whether you feel as if there is a potential that the
18 methane you're detecting at Gas Monitoring Probe 24
19 might represent subsurface lateral migration of gas from
20 the landfill beneath the 17-foot deep barrier wall.

21 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I guess the -- the statement
22 at the end was the question?

23 I would like to say that at GMP 24, it extends
24 down to a depth of about 12 feet. There's a permeable
25 layer that goes from about 12 feet to 15 feet. That's
Page 58

1 are in water.

2 The Waste Management Board wanted them to go
3 deeper to the point where we could assure that they
4 would never -- the bottom of the GMPs would never be out
5 of groundwater, and that's the reason we are installing
6 the additional GMPs.

7 So I don't think it's a fair statement to say
8 that the barrier wall is not working. It's keeping the
9 methane below the levels along the fence line GMPs and
10 at all but one of the U.C.S.F. GMPs.

11 One of the theories that you could propose for
12 the methane that you found at GMP 24 is: There was a
13 little cloud, for want of a better word, of methane that
14 was not extracted during the active extraction system.
15 We don't know very much about the lithology beneath
16 Building 830. Obviously, we didn't go through and put
17 borings down over there. It may have been trapped over
18 there, and all of the activities that we did it kind of
19 pulled it towards GMP 24.

20 I'm not saying that's what happened. I'm
21 saying it's a possibility.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: I had one question.

24 After nine months, after nine months, Maz, of
25 nothing there and Ground Monitoring 24 all of a sudden
Page 60

1 you get a -- you get a high strike of methane. So if it
2 was there at the beginning, there would have been a high
3 strike.
4 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Well, that's what I think too
5 is that we would have seen it earlier. We had it down
6 low, and I just think that it migrated from someplace
7 beneath the building. We did put in a bunch of
8 temporary probes and --
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. Thank you.
10 MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- that's where it centered.
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry. Okay. Thank you
12 so much.
13 All right. Next we have a -- an HRA update,
14 Miss Lowman, and you have about twenty minutes down from
15 your thirty.
16 MS. WRIGHT: I think you had a question over
17 there.
18 MS. LOWMAN: I'll go fast.
19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. If you -- You need to
20 leave questions at the end.
21 I'm sorry. Did I miss a question?
22 MS. WRIGHT: Mr. Tisdell had a question.
23 MR. TISDELL: Yes, I did have a question. It
24 was asked.
25 MS. PENDERGRASS: We closed that. We closed

Page 61

1 that, Mr. Tisdell. Hold on --
2 MR. TISDELL: But how can you close something
3 when there's a question that concerns the community?
4 How? Would you mind answering me that?
5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Lowman, can you hold
6 just a moment?
7 MS. LOWMAN: Sure.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tisdell. And
9 Mr. Mazowiecki, where did you go?
10 Oh, here he is right here.
11 MR. TISDELL: Okay. Mr. Maz, now, you say
12 if -- if that -- if that wall wasn't working, you
13 wouldn't be getting readings like you are, if I -- if I
14 state you correctly right?
15 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm not sure what the question
16 is. Can --?
17 MR. TISDELL: Okay. When you say -- okay. You
18 said something in reference if a wall wasn't working, it
19 would be a higher readings, right? If the wall wasn't
20 working, there would be a higher reading?
21 MR. MAZOWIECKI: What I was saying is that if
22 the wall wasn't working, we would start to see
23 situations like we had back in April of 2002 where the
24 methane was migrating onto the U.C.S.F. compound, and we
25 were receiving extremely high levels of methane. By

Page 62

1 "extremely high," I'm talking in 60 to 70 percent range
2 of methane.
3 We are now seeing 0 percent methane --
4 MR. TISDELL: Okay.
5 MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- locations.
6 MR. TISDELL: Okay. If the wall was working,
7 why are you replacing it?
8 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I wouldn't choose to classify
9 what we did as "replacing."
10 MR. TISDELL: Did you bring it up and go back
11 down in it -- with it?
12 MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. What we did is: We
13 injected some grout behind it.
14 MS. HARRISON: You reinforced it?
15 MR. MAZOWIECKI: We reinforced it, but we did
16 not replace it.
17 MS. HARRISON: Which basically means you put
18 another wall behind it.
19 MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes.
20 MS. HARRISON: Which means the original wall
21 wasn't working, which is what he's asking.
22 MR. MAZOWIECKI: I don't know that I would word
23 it in that way, but --
24 MS. HARRISON: I'm going to leave it alone
25 because I'm not the engineer here, okay?

Page 63

1 MR. MAZOWIECKI: As I said before, there was a
2 possibility that there was some punctures, and that was
3 the reason that we injected the grout to correct that
4 situation.
5 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
6 MR. MAZOWIECKI: And we feel that it's been
7 corrected now.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, sir.
9 MR. TISDELL: Thank you, Mr. Maz.
10 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Lowman, I'm
11 so sorry.
12 MS. LOWMAN: It's okay. It's all right.
13 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
14 MS. LOWMAN: It's nice to be with you this
15 month. We apologize for Hurricane Isabel and her
16 destruction last month that postponed this briefing. So
17 we'll go from where we are today.
18 HRA status report, Historical Radiological
19 Assessment. I'm sure you are all familiar with that
20 document and the long-heralded HRA.
21 We have additional archive records that we have
22 researched. We have a second draft that we are
23 preparing. We are working on finalizing the interview
24 process, and all of this has resulted in a delay and a
25 new schedule.

Page 64

1 Okay. The additional records we reviewed were
2 at the Naval Sea Systems Command Archives in Washington,
3 D.C. There really wasn't much information on
4 radiological operations out at Hunters Point. However,
5 there was a lot of information on the Triple A contracts
6 that we might be able to extract some building
7 information from.

8 The other records reviewed were the National
9 Association of Atomic Veterans records. We have
10 reviewed those in August 2003. They have a very, very
11 large volume of records.

12 However, most of them pertain directly to the
13 exposures that the veterans received when they
14 participated in the atomic test. Very little of it has
15 anything to do with Hunters Point. We were able to pull
16 out, oh, maybe a dozen, 15 documents, but there's really
17 very little information there for us.

18 MS. HARRISON: Laurie, there was nothing in
19 those records that tells you what they did with the
20 by-products or waste products?

21 MS. LOWMAN: No, there was not. They talked
22 about the ships and the exposure levels on the ships
23 themselves, but -- and what happened with the personnel,
24 where the personnel worked, but not Shipyard personnel.
25 So there was really very little information we could

Page 65

1 the effects of atomic -- nuclear or atomic weapons, and
2 they are working with the veterans on any claims they
3 have against the government.

4 They do have records on Hunters Point. We have
5 reviewed those records in October 2003. A lot of the
6 records were duplicates of what we have already had.

7 But we did get about, if I'm going to quantify
8 it, I will say 2 inches of new information, 'cause the
9 paper was about 2 inches thick. I have not had a chance
10 to review those. We just finished that last Friday, and
11 I've been traveling since Monday. So I'm not exactly
12 sure everything that's in those.

13 We are going to have a second internal -- now
14 it's DoD review. We had a first internal Navy review in
15 the document. We received significant comments on it.
16 We have made extensive changes to the document. The
17 document that was 400 pages is now 800 pages. So it's
18 growing by the month. There's a lot of new information
19 that was incorporated.

20 The reason we are calling it a second DoD
21 review is because DTRA and the Army Corps of Engineers
22 have asked be included in the review process, and the
23 Army Corps of Engineers would be Jerry Vincent, who's
24 managing the FUDS property for the base.

25 Personnel interviews. Pretty much we have

Page 67

1 use.

2 MS. OLIVA: Laurie?

3 MS. LOWMAN: Yeah.

4 MS. OLIVA: Did they come back with the ships
5 to the Shipyard, the personnel?

6 MS. LOWMAN: The personnel? Some did. Some
7 did not. The -- the folks that received the higher
8 doses were on the target ships, and many of those were
9 sunk out at Kwajalein. And the target ships that did
10 come back here, the ones with the highest dose rates
11 came back and were towed because the sailors couldn't be
12 on them.

13 MS. OLIVA: What about the sailors?

14 MS. LOWMAN: They came back on different ships.

15 MS. OLIVA: They came back --?

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Can we ask the questions at
17 the end and --?

18 MS. LOWMAN: Let me -- let me keep going so I
19 can get through the information I have, and then you can
20 get me all your questions, okay? That would be better.

21 We reviewed the NAAV records in August.

22 Then we found records associated with the
23 Defense Threat Reduction Agency. Now, they used to be
24 called the Defense Nuclear Agency, and they have been
25 renamed. It is a tri-service organization that works on

Page 66

1 concluded all the interviews. We have made multiple
2 attempts to reach anyone and everyone we could.

3 I know that everyone was very interested in us
4 reaching Mr. Tom Olson. I have tried diligently, and we
5 have not been able to contact him. He is no longer in
6 Albuquerque. Maurice Campbell was working with us on
7 that, and he was not able to find him either. It's kind
8 of like he's just disappeared. But should he come up or
9 should he -- he reach us, we would be happy to conclude
10 an interview process with him.

11 The information has been summarized in an
12 appendix to H. -- to the HRA.

13 Final contacts are being made with the folks
14 that we did the in-depth interviews with. We cannot
15 publish any interview unless we receive a signed release
16 document from the interviewee agreeing to the
17 information to go in the document.

18 So -- and what we are finding is: Some of the
19 interviewees, when we type up the interview, they come
20 back and say, "Oh, I don't want to say this, and I want
21 to say that." They are going back and forth with
22 several of them. So we are hoping to get that taken
23 care of.

24 So we have -- because of all these delays, we
25 have a new HRA time line. Our original August

Page 68

1 distribution was delayed. We were going to shoot for a
2 November distribution when we got new information from
3 the DTRA.

4 Those records were made available to us and --
5 when Hurricane Isabel hit, which basically Hurricane
6 Isabel by itself slowed us -- took us out two weeks. We
7 couldn't get to work, couldn't -- had no power at the
8 office or at home. So it was -- it was a definite
9 delay.

10 Now that we have had these delays, we are
11 moving into the holiday period. So we have come up with
12 a new time line.

13 In November we are going to distribute the
14 internal draft for the DoD review. The comments are due
15 back to us in December 2003 when we're having a meeting
16 out at RASO to discuss all the comments, and we will be
17 distributing the draft final to regulators and the
18 public early in 2004. I do not have an exact date yet.
19 But believe me, it's going to be as soon as I can get it
20 because I'm really getting tired of working on it.

21 But I -- We have a great team, but it's been
22 over a year now. We are all getting a little punchy.
23 So we'd really like to get it out there for everybody to
24 see.

25 As I always do, I always try to cover some

Page 69

1 those levels of contamination in the ventilation system
2 and in the flooring, that they would have worked in
3 there 12 hours a day, seven days a week, for the ten
4 years that the artists have been working in the
5 building.

6 I don't have the final information on that yet.
7 Commander Fragoso -- maybe some of you remember him. He
8 had briefed for me one time one month. He is working on
9 the assessment, and hopefully we should have all the
10 information by the end of next week.

11 The Building 366 findings. I'd like to kind of
12 put them into perspective, because the levels were
13 really very low.

14 We -- The levels that we found were in samples
15 of material that we took out of the ventilation system
16 and that we took out of the drains. So our -- we are
17 comparing them to outdoor release limits because that
18 would -- normally we would quantify material and soil.

19 So it comes out in a picocuries-per-gram ratio,
20 and that's how we would make our comparison for the
21 samples out of the ventilation ducting or the drains.

22 And our release limit for cesium outside is
23 .13 picocuries per gram, and our release limit for
24 radium is 2.0 picocuries per gram. Now, that includes
25 background radiation. So that is not 2.0 above

Page

1 upcoming site projects, the different radiological
2 issues that are going on at the base.

3 Building 366 -- I know that there was some
4 presentations made, and I wasn't here for those. So
5 we're going to talk a little bit about that, and we're
6 going to talk about some new projects on Parcel E.

7 Building 366, you all know -- you all received
8 the fact sheet in September of '03. We have found some
9 low levels of radium and cesium contamination. They
10 were found in the -- in the inactive ventilation system
11 and in the floor drains.

12 To access where the contamination is, it's
13 going to require us to remove ventilation systems from a
14 very high ceiling, dig out drains and piping in the
15 flooring; and the type of work and the extent of the
16 work would be impossible to have anyone in the building
17 during that time. So the Navy is working to relocate
18 the artists. We have addressed the relocation sites to
19 make sure they were not radiologically impacted.

20 And we are also working to address the artists'
21 concerns. I've had numerous phone calls about artists
22 being concerned about any exposure they may have
23 received.

24 We are doing a dose assessment projection to
25 say that an individual had worked in that building with

Page 70

1 background. That is 2.0 with the background included.
2 So those are very, very low limits.

3 Matter of fact, the cesium limit is so low that
4 we cannot really see it with a detection instrument. We
5 have to sample and run it with gamma spectroscopy in the
6 laboratory to be able to see those limits.

7 These are very conservative limits. We have
8 established these with the EPA. And we are really
9 working to, you know, ensure long-term protection for --
10 at the site for everyone.

11 In the inactive ventilation system, we had two
12 samples above the radium limit, and we had four samples
13 above the cesium limit. That does not mean we had six
14 samples. Two of those samples had both cesium and
15 radium in them.

16 So we had four spots in the ventilation system
17 that -- that we took material from that exceeded those
18 picocurie-per-gram limits. And when it says on the
19 slide there that it's less than "minimal detectable
20 activity," that is less than the gas spectroscopy system
21 in the laboratory could measure. So that is very, very
22 low.

23 On the floor drain samples, we had four sample
24 above the radium limit and three samples above the
25 cesium limit. Now, that only means that four drains had

Page 72

1 contamination in them. It doesn't mean that seven did.
2 Some of these are the same samples that came out, and we
3 found two different isotopes in them.
4 The building -- When we do -- After we do
5 the -- the decontamination in the building and the
6 remediation, we're going to establish a release limit
7 for the surfaces in the building, and that will be
8 established with the California Department of Health
9 Services. The EPA defaults to Cal. DHS for all the
10 structures and inside the structures out at Hunters
11 Point.

12 It will be based on surface readings in
13 disintegrations per minute, which is again based on an
14 old NRC reg. guide, 1.86. That is what Cal. DHS is
15 using right now as their standard.

16 So after we do the remediation, after we do
17 everything and we feel we have cleaned the building, we
18 are going to do what they call a final status survey.
19 It will be done in accordance with the MARSSIM, the
20 Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation
21 Manual. And that final status survey will be used to
22 document that the building is -- we hope, obviously --
23 ready for free release.

24 And after we do the final status survey, we
25 will provide all that documentation to the regulators

Page 73

1 for their review. But again, that will be based on the
2 standards with Cal. DHS.

3 One area that I also believe you were briefed
4 on is IR-02 northwest and central. This is moving on to
5 the new activities in Parcel E.

6 IR-02 northwest and central is an area that is
7 known to contain a certain number of radium devices. It
8 has been referred to as the radium dial disposal area.
9 However, in researching for the HRA, we cannot find any
10 documentation that indicates that it was used as a
11 radium dial disposal area.

12 They are basically finding a radium device or a
13 radioluminescent device at one every 2 cubic yards, and
14 that is not indicative of a radium dial disposal area,
15 but there is a large concentration of those devices in
16 that area.

17 The site work plan. I have that. Matter of
18 fact, I brought that with me, but I haven't had a chance
19 to open it.

20 We are in the second draft now for RASO's
21 review. It will follow previously established
22 remediation protocols that we established for the
23 Phase 5 radiological investigations. And again, the
24 release limit for radium is 2 picocuries per gram
25 because it is an outside area.

Page 74

1 We are also going to -- When we do the
2 remediation, we will be testing to identify whether or
3 not there are any other radionuclides present,
4 radioluminescent devices. Most of them used radium-226
5 as the isotope to mix with the paint for the
6 glow-in-the-dark type of mixture. However, some used
7 strontium-90. Some used promethium-147, and some used
8 tritium or hydrogen 3.

9 So we will be testing to ensure that we have
10 the isotope radium, and that there isn't another one
11 that we have located. We will also, of course, be
12 testing for cesium-137 and strontium-90 because of the
13 work NRDL did with all of the materials they brought
14 back from the atomic test sites.

15 We will be taking all prudent safety
16 precautions. We'll be doing air monitoring. We will
17 ensure the workers are wearing the proper PPE. We will
18 do everything possible that we can do.

19 I understand there was some discussion of
20 having a tent over a certain part of the remediation
21 site. That would be not -- That would not be something
22 that RASO would recommend when working in a bay fill
23 area. We do these all of the time all over the country.
24 We have approximately 20 in process right now. We would
25 not ask for those precautions.

Page 75

1 Matter of fact, in some instances, not only is
2 it very, very expensive to get an enclosure big enough
3 for the equipment to operate in, but it can cause some
4 other problems with the tent itself becoming
5 contaminated and not allowing radon from the radium
6 devices to dissipate.

7 Just a minute. So -- You have to wait till
8 I'm through. I'm hurrying. I'm hurrying. Just bear
9 with me. I promise I'll answer it.

10 So we are looking at all the safety
11 precautions. We are assessing whether or not --
12 My understanding is: There was a request to
13 have it over a certain area where the material was going
14 to be taken for screening. And again, as I said, we
15 have -- you know, if RASO felt that we needed one, we
16 would absolutely have one in place. And this is not
17 something that we would normally do. So we are looking
18 at it, but I personally cannot make a recommendation for
19 that at this time.

20 This action will address both the
21 radiologically contaminated material and the mixed
22 waste, and that is hazardous waste with a radiological
23 contaminant mixed in. So both of those fall under my
24 program. We would remove anything like that and send it
25 for proper disposal.

Page 76

1 At the same time, when we do this, we will be
2 testing. We have to test with a TCLP, which is toxicity
3 leaching process, right?
4 MR. FORMAN: [Inaudible.]
5 MS. LOWMAN: Potential?
6 Toxicity characteristic leaching potential.
7 Thank you. I always get it -- one word wrong.
8 So we will be using TCLPs. We have to use
9 TCLPs in order to profile the waste to get it into the
10 disposal site. The disposal site has to have that
11 information to know whether or not the radioactive waste
12 has any other hazardous component.
13 So the material that we are taking out will
14 have full testing both radiologically and for the CERCLA
15 waste or the hazardous constituents.
16 There's another area we are working in, the
17 sedimentation basin. That is an effort to build up the
18 shoreline to prevent any migration of material off of
19 IR-121. It is not a large effort. However, we have
20 discovered some sandblast grit at the site.
21 Because of the history of NRD, we're going to
22 do what we do with all the sandblast grit that we find,
23 and we are going to sample it for potential radiological
24 contamination and just make a decision about the amount
25 of it that is there and whether or not it warrants a

Page 77

1 removal process.
2 Those samples were taken today. We're -- We
3 would have the analysis probably first of next week, and
4 we will be making a decision about that sandblast grit
5 next week.
6 Parcel E shoreline survey. Now, this was a
7 shoreline survey. The shoreline in Parcel E covers
8 1 1/2 miles, and this was done in the summer of 2001.
9 We had some money available. We took that time to do a
10 scoping survey for radiological materials along the
11 shoreline in Parcel E.
12 The survey covered from the low tide mark at
13 the lowest tide we could get in the summer, which is
14 pretty far out there, up to 50 feet above the mean tide
15 mark.
16 To do this survey we divided the shoreline into
17 150-foot-wide grids. And these grids were identified
18 alphabetically "A" through "Z" and "AA" through "YY" for
19 a total of 51 grids.
20 Each grid was divided into 3-foot lanes. And
21 again our readings were taken at 2- to 3-foot intervals.
22 There was just a straight scan. They stopped for
23 three -- six seconds every 2 to 3 feet, took a reading.
24 Over 90,000 readings were taken, and it's a lot
25 of data to go through. However, only 47 samples were

Page 78

1 taken. Those were based on certain 10-foot grids or
2 more than 10-foot grids. Hundred-foot grids we
3 established there where we had found evidence of so
4 radiological contamination.
5 Focus was on identifying areas of concern for
6 future actions. And elevated levels greater than twice
7 background were identified in 44 of the 51 grids. Now,
8 that is not to say that we had high levels in all 44 of
9 those grids. That is to say that there were readings
10 over twice background in those 44 grids.
11 We're concentrating on areas where the elevated
12 counts were found. We are using the shoreline survey
13 now to identify our areas of concern along the
14 shoreline, delineate the future actions taken based --
15 to be taken based on those areas of concern, and this
16 will also allow us to prioritize our future actions by
17 using time-critical removal actions to eliminate these
18 sources of radioactivity.
19 We will be conducting sampling at areas with
20 the highest count rates, and that will also include --
21 the TCLP samplings will have to profile for the waste
22 removal, and we will be doing time-critical removal
23 actions for the areas of concentrated elevated counts,
24 in particular a metal reef area, which is down in the
25 southeast portion there on the map near the piers, and a

Page 78

1 slag area, which is actually over on the shore by
2 IR-121, as Doug is pointing to.
3 Thank you very much.
4 Those will be two of the areas that we'll be
5 concentrating on on the shoreline first.
6 And that's it. We're ready for questions.
7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Miss Oliva, you are
8 the first one.
9 MS. LOWMAN: I promise, I'll answer your
10 question.
11 MS. OLIVA: Okay, Laurie.
12 MS. LOWMAN: Microphone?
13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.
14 MS. OLIVA: Let's talk about dose assessments.
15 MS. LOWMAN: Okay, let's talk about dose
16 assessments.
17 MS. OLIVA: We have two issues here. We have
18 the dose -- You're determining those assessments for
19 the 29 in Building 366 outside of their physicalness,
20 correct?
21 MS. LOWMAN: I'm assessing -- making the dose
22 assessment based on a person working in Building 366
23 12 hours a day, seven days a week, for ten years.
24 MS. OLIVA: Okay. I would suggest -- it's a
25 suggestion -- that perhaps you take one of the 29 and do

Page 80

1 a medical procedure on them.
2 MS. LOWMAN: We have not found any evidence so
3 far the need for a medical procedure. That's why we are
4 doing the dose assessment, to see if one would be
5 warranted.
6 None of the workers in that building have
7 received any dose on their dosimetry. They had -- came
8 out -- All came out with zero.
9 MS. OLIVA: You tested them?
10 MS. LOWMAN: Yes.
11 MS. OLIVA: How did you test them?
12 MS. LOWMAN: They wore dosimeters. It's a
13 lithium fluoride type device that registers any dose of
14 radiation that they receive when they're working in any
15 particular area. They wear them the entire time they
16 are there.
17 MS. OLIVA: So the 29 had these -- these
18 devices on?
19 MS. LOWMAN: Are you talking 29 artists?
20 MS. OLIVA: Yes.
21 MS. LOWMAN: No. The workers who did the
22 surveys in the building wore those devices.
23 MS. OLIVA: Okay. Well, I would suggest that
24 perhaps you would consider -- I believe that some of
25 them are still there -- you have -- you take a sample on
Page 81

1 one of them and have them wear one of these devices.
2 MS. LOWMAN: I can mention that. I can look
3 into that.
4 MS. OLIVA: That would be great.
5 MS. LOWMAN: But I think our dose assessment --
6 we really need to do that first because that will give
7 us a baseline and an idea of if there was a potential
8 for them to have received any dose.
9 MS. OLIVA: Would you consider any full-body
10 counting?
11 MS. LOWMAN: We did not -- I do not feel it's
12 really recommended at this point until we do the dose
13 assessment.
14 MS. OLIVA: And how long will that take?
15 MS. LOWMAN: We should have the dose assessment
16 done by the end of next week.
17 MS. OLIVA: Okay. You also mentioned that
18 there were two other isotopes you found in 366?
19 MS. LOWMAN: I found radium and cesium in 366,
20 and then we found two small spots of the rim on the
21 floor. Those were from the artists using thoriated
22 tungsten welding rods. That is some -- It's a very
23 common welding rod that is sold openly.
24 MS. OLIVA: I'm aware of that.
25 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

Page 82

1 MS. OLIVA: And the second one?
2 MS. LOWMAN: We had radium, cesium, and
3 thorium. Those were --
4 MS. OLIVA: So --
5 MS. LOWMAN: -- the only ones we found.
6 MS. OLIVA: Oh, I thought you said there were
7 two other additional isotopes.
8 MS. LOWMAN: If I did, I misspoke.
9 MR. ATTENDEE: Two spots.
10 MS. OLIVA: Okay.
11 MS. LOWMAN: Okay?
12 MS. OLIVA: Now, dose assessment. You had
13 mentioned the gentleman that came out here who was -- is
14 planning at -- on Parcel E to find out the clocks since
15 the Navy was in the Bulova watch business.
16 MS. LOWMAN: Well, kind of.
17 MS. OLIVA: Okay. You said that you have --
18 MS. LOWMAN: Not exactly that, but okay.
19 MS. OLIVA: You have remediated similar areas?
20 MS. LOWMAN: All across the country.
21 MS. OLIVA: Okay. Have there been people in
22 close proximity or on the land when these remediations
23 were taking place?
24 MS. LOWMAN: Some of them, yes.
25 MS. OLIVA: How many of, would you consider?
Page 83

1 Would you consider maybe 300 people?
2 MS. LOWMAN: Well, there's not -- I mean, are
3 you saying 300 people on the landfill while the
4 remediation --
5 MS. OLIVA: Yes.
6 MS. LOWMAN: -- is going on?
7 MS. OLIVA: Yes.
8 MS. LOWMAN: Very few people are on the
9 landfill while the remediation is going on.
10 MS. OLIVA: We are very close to the landfill,
11 the artists. We are very -- The artists who are really
12 close to it in 366 are very close to other -- other --
13 all of us. We have a wind factor here around the base.
14 MS. LOWMAN: Mm-hmm.
15 MS. OLIVA: And that's why I suggested to that
16 gentleman to have it tented.
17 If there was an issue of having -- if -- I
18 would like you to consider the amount of people that are
19 sitting here on a Superfund site that need protection,
20 because in example that you've -- you've conducted
21 before, there haven't been that amount of people on it
22 while you were doing remediation. And --
23 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
24 MS. OLIVA: And I realize that the tent can be
25 contaminated. But if the tent could be contaminated, we

Page 84

1 can be contaminated upwind; and I would much rather have
2 the tent contaminated than the rest of us here.
3 And with the same respect to the Building 366,
4 Mr. Forman had mentioned earlier that it's already
5 tented in tin. I don't think that's a real -- real good
6 thing to do. My -- my impression -- I'm not a
7 scientist -- is that cesium-137, a fission product, low
8 levels of that scientifically may be justified, but
9 healthwise it isn't.
10 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
11 MS. OLIVA: That's all.
12 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Mason and then
14 Mr. Tompkins and --
15 MS. LOWMAN: Let me --
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Mr. Tisdell and then
17 Ms. Asher.
18 MS. LOWMAN: Let me say something quickly.
19 We would -- If we don't use the tent, we will
20 take all the proper safety precautions, including
21 wetting down everything, dust minimization. There
22 should be absolutely no dust coming from that work site.
23 MS. OLIVA: Well, how about --
24 MS. LOWMAN: And --
25 MS. OLIVA: -- tenting Building 101?

Page 85

1 MS. LOWMAN: Tenting Building 101. Is that the
2 one you are in?
3 MS. OLIVA: Yes.
4 MS. LOWMAN: Yes, okay.
5 MS. OLIVA: If you are coming on Saturday -- I
6 hope you are --
7 MS. LOWMAN: Yes.
8 MS. OLIVA: -- you'll see us.
9 MS. LOWMAN: Oh, good. Okay.
10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay, Mr. Mason.
11 MS. WRIGHT: Mr. Tisdell had his hand up first.
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
13 MS. LOWMAN: Who do we have?
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: It's his question. Just one
15 moment.
16 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Go ahead, Mr. Mason.
18 MR. MASON: Hey, Laurie. How are you? Good to
19 see you.
20 MS. LOWMAN: Nice to see you.
21 MR. MASON: One of the questions that -- that I
22 was going to ask Pat is information on certification for
23 the truckers in there to move this low-level radiation.
24 Is there any type of certification they need?
25 MS. LOWMAN: It depends on the levels of

Page 86

1 materials that we are using. In some instances, there
2 are certifications and special licensing required. In
3 addition, some of them require a million-dollar bond
4 the waste transport; and some of them also, depending on
5 the levels of what we are moving, required the drivers
6 to have dosimetry to wear.
7 So far we have not moved anything from here
8 that would require that. But I can try to get all that
9 information gathered for you and get it to Pat or -- so
10 he can pass it on to you.
11 MR. MASON: Most of the drivers that are
12 certified in the community have a million-dollar bond
13 anyway. And so we just wanted to know if there was some
14 further certification that they needed, and if so, what
15 type and --
16 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
17 MR. MASON: -- you know.
18 MS. LOWMAN: I will get that information for
19 you and get it transmitted to you probably by e-mail to
20 Pat; or if you get me your e-mail address, I'll get it
21 directly to you.
22 MR. MASON: Thank you very much.
23 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
24 MR. TOMPKINS: I'll go after --
25 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

Page

1 MR. TOMPKINS: -- then I'll follow.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
3 Mr. Tisdell and then Mr. Tompkins.
4 MR. TISDELL: Miss Lowman.
5 MS. LOWMAN: Yes.
6 MR. TISDELL: Now, sorry.
7 MS. LOWMAN: Go ahead.
8 MR. TISDELL: Ne- -- But anyway, hi, how are
9 you?
10 MS. LOWMAN: Hi.
11 MR. TISDELL: Okay. With the people who's
12 living right on that side and every --
13 MS. LOWMAN: What --? Just a minute. What
14 side? Where?
15 MR. TISDELL: Behind 830.
16 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. Up the hill.
17 MR. TISDELL: Huh?
18 MS. LOWMAN: Behind 815 up the hill.
19 MR. TISDELL: That's 815?
20 MS. LOWMAN: Yeah.
21 MR. TISDELL: That big building --
22 MS. LOWMAN: Yeah.
23 MR. TISDELL: -- no windows. Okay, the people
24 living over there. And everyone here can tell you
25 that -- that that wind comes up that hill off of where

Page 88

1 you going to be digging at. And you wouldn't put people
2 before plastic?

3 MS. LOWMAN: Of course I would put people
4 before plastic.

5 MR. TISDELL: Okay. Why would you s- --?

6 MS. LOWMAN: Absolutely.

7 MR. TISDELL: Why would you say that putting
8 the tent up is -- is really not necessary and when you
9 going to be exposing and stuff, which you can't
10 definitely say what's what's what's what, and it's
11 blowing right up in our face?

12 MS. LOWMAN: Well, first of all, we would take
13 precautions so it would not blow in your face.

14 Second of all, we would have air monitoring
15 going all the time. We have done other remediations out
16 there and have not generated any waste or any -- we've
17 had air monitors at every site we have done remediations
18 at, and we have not recorded a single bit of
19 radioactivity from any remediation that we have --

20 MR. TISDELL: Would you like to come up and get
21 some dust off my cars?

22 MS. LOWMAN: Sure.

23 MR. TISDELL: You're more than welcome to.

24 MS. LOWMAN: Sure.

25 MS. SUMCHAI: It's the particulates. That's

Page 89

1 MR. KAO: No. We have not seen -- You're
2 correct. We have not seen the work plan. But last time
3 we have heard in the presentation, they are still
4 planning on -- to have the hazardous waste redeposit in
5 the ground, which we object. And that needs to be
6 resolved.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

8 MR. FORMAN: All right.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Second question. Dealing with
10 traditional risk assessments that has been utilized in
11 the United States, it's been based on -- medical model's
12 been a 35-year-old healthy white male.

13 In your assessment to the radiation exposure,
14 do you plan to use the various genetic variance between
15 men and women and since there are men and women working
16 there in terms of their factors as to radiation
17 exposure?

18 MS. LOWMAN: I believe that we will use
19 probably the standard. But I can talk to Commander
20 Frago when I go back and ask him --

21 MR. TOMPKINS: I know in --

22 MS. LOWMAN: -- to use multiple standards.

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Because I know in '96, 1997 we
24 were at EPA in Atlanta, and they had just begin take a
25 look at the difference between men and women exposure

Page 91

1 his point.

2 MS. LOWMAN: Yeah. I mean, I have to say, you
3 know, I was out there. I was out there today. The wind
4 blows --

5 MR. TISDELL: They been sitting up there for
6 two years.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. The next questions,
8 Mr. Tompkins?

9 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

10 MR. TOMPKINS: Three part.

11 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

12 MR. TOMPKINS: Mr. Chein Kao, in terms of the
13 removal of the radiation dials, has the State and the
14 Navy come to agreement in terms of first removing the
15 chemical contamination before they address the radio --
16 radiology -- radioactive material? Has that been
17 resolved?

18 MR. KAO: No, we have not. We are -- we are
19 arranging to have attorneys to meet to discuss
20 regulations --

21 MS. ATTENDEE: All right.

22 MR. KAO: -- regarding that.

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. So that there is -- set
24 procedures have not passed State's -- has not addressed
25 the State's concerns in this matter?

Page 90

1 risk factor.

2 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

3 MR. TOMPKINS: Second -- Third part is: How
4 old is the Cal. DHL [sic] standard that you're using?
5 Because some of the stuff on radium that you're using
6 back in '96 was going back to 1940.

7 MS. LOWMAN: This reg. guide 1.86 has actually
8 been superseded by a less restrictive document, and NRC
9 doesn't use the DPM measurement now. They use a
10 dose-based assessment of 25 millirem. The reg. guide
11 1.86 is a lower risk factor than that. And D --
12 Cal. DHS is being more conservative in the standard in
13 applying reg. guide 1.86.

14 MR. TOMPKINS: And final question, as we had
15 discussion with the manganese and the effect of
16 attaching the manganese to the melanin in people of
17 color: In your assessment or any of the assessments
18 that was talked about in Treasure eye -- not Treasure --
19 yeah, Treasure Island that genetic variance in the race
20 would be considered in your assessments on risk
21 assessment, is that being taken into account here?

22 MS. LOWMAN: I can ask Commander Frago if he
23 will do that. I haven't seen all the standards he's
24 using yet. I will see those next week. So I can -- I
25 can see what standards are available for us to use on

Page 92

1 the dose assessment.

2 MR. TOMPKINS: 'Cause we are concerned, even
3 though we are giving the argument background and et
4 cetera, about: African-Americans, Filipinos, Samoans
5 are at higher risk than threshold is much lower before
6 ill effects take place, and historically this has been
7 normal also.

8 MS. LOWMAN: I know I -- I have to base this
9 dose assessment that we are doing right now on the
10 artists that are in the building and have been occupying
11 it. So if I could get --

12 MR. TOMPKINS: Men and women.

13 MS. LOWMAN: Yeah -- the various ethnicity of
14 those occupants and the artists that have been in there,
15 I can try to apply that. Okay?

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Asher?

17 MS. ASHER: Yeah. Miss Oliva covered some of
18 the material. But I have specific concerns about health
19 and safety issues for residents of this community and
20 for artists, for people who are on site.

21 And I -- you know, I guess you haven't come up
22 with a final work plan, and I'm wondering how it
23 interfaces with the emergency removal actions that
24 you're doing at the same time.

25 I think that -- I mean, I just have to make a

Page 93

1 So I -- I would like the Navy to show some good
2 faith by providing that information to Arc Ecology, and
3 I want -- I mean, your first presentation that you did
4 here on the methane, I mean, I was present at a tech
5 meeting for that, you know, where you talked about the
6 solution's in place, that it's safe. You don't know if
7 it's safe or not. So I urge, you know, the
8 precautionary principle here, you know.

9 That's all. Thank you.

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

11 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Before you answer
14 that, we need to take a break because we have a live
15 person with fingers that are having no blood at this
16 moment. So we need to stop for ten minutes. We have --
17 Dr. Sumchai has a question. Miss Harrison has a
18 question, and Mr. Manuel has a question, and we have a
19 question from the audience at this point, and we have a
20 question at the end, and we have Lynne's question.

21 So at this point, we need take a ten-minute
22 break, and you all by coming back and reconvening will
23 agree to going longer this evening than 8:10 because we
24 are already at 8:10. All right? We'll stop at this
25 time.

Page

1 comment that I personally don't have a lot of confidence
2 in the way the Navy has been proceeding with the
3 emergency removal actions.

4 And you can tell us that you will be doing
5 everything possible to protect our health, but I have
6 not seen that over the last few years with dust
7 abatement. Artists and residents of the community have
8 been exposed to large amounts of dust and particulate
9 matter in the Navy cleanup procedures. And that is
10 true, because I was here. Okay?

11 So don't say that you're going to do everything
12 possible, because they have not done that in the past.
13 And so that's my comment.

14 And I'm very concerned about what the work plan
15 is. I want to know what you're doing, when you're doing
16 it, and I want to know -- I know that Arc Ecology has --
17 has asked the Navy to address the emergency removal
18 actions to at least give more public information about
19 that; and as far as I know, that -- that hasn't been
20 addressed yet. Has it?

21 MS. LOIZOS: We haven't gotten a formal -- We
22 submitted a formal letter. I haven't gotten a formal
23 letter back, but it's been -- the promise has been made
24 verbally. We haven't -- you know . . .

25 MS. ASHER: Yeah.

Page 94

1 (Recess 8:02 p.m. to 8:09 p.m.)

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Can we reconvene, please?
3 Otherwise, tomorrow we'll be tired.

4 MS. ATTENDEE: We're already tired.

5 (Off-record simultaneous colloquy.)

6 MS. LOWMAN: Let me -- let me make a comment
7 on -- on --

8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

9 MS. LOWMAN: -- Lani's -- what Lani had to say.

10 First of all, I haven't finished reviewing the
11 draft work plan; but when I do finish reviewing it, it
12 will go out for comment. It will go out to the public
13 and to the regulators.

14 And the dates of the actual work will be
15 provided. So everyone will know what's going on, when
16 it's going on, the time frames, the sampling procedures.
17 Everything's going to be out there for everyone to
18 review. Okay? So if that helps you out, yeah. Okay.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Dr. Sumchai?

20 MS. SUMCHAI: Let's see. What I -- I'd like to
21 do in lieu of the limitations --

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: You need to turn it on.

23 MS. SUMCHAI: What I'd do -- like to do --

24 MR. MASON: The RAB is back in --

25 MS. SUMCHAI: -- in lieu of --

Page 96

1 MR. MASON: -- session.
2 MS. SUMCHAI: -- in limitations on time if it's
3 okay with you is: I will forgo my subcommittee report
4 and just make a couple of comments.

5 I did send most of you by e-mail the minutes of
6 last night's meeting. They're very extensive. It was a
7 very productive meeting. I wanted to thank David
8 Terzian and Mr. Webster, one of the artists, for
9 attending. I'm sorry that Georgia and Lani weren't able
10 to attend.

11 Some of the concerns that you are expressing
12 are shared but are redundant. I think in a more
13 intimate environment, we could have explored some --
14 some of them in greater depth. But let me just make a
15 couple of statements just to clarify some things that I
16 think that are important.

17 With regard to the lithium fluoride dosimetry
18 that is -- that the workers are wearing, those do not
19 measure the cumulative additive effects of chronic
20 low-dose radiation of someone staying in that area for
21 ten years, 12 hours a day, seven days a week, might be
22 subjected to. So, you know, that's just an issue I
23 wanted to clarify.

24 Also, I want to remind everybody that with
25 regard to the Cal. DHS clearance standards for

Page 97

1 Building 366 as well as for Parcel A Buildings 3 --
2 excuse -- yeah, 816 and 821, these are again being
3 legally challenged in the superior court in the state of
4 California and in the legislature. And as of November,
5 we need to revisit what happened in the legislature with
6 regard to passage of bills and the current standards in
7 the state of California.

8 Mr. Terzian made the important point that the
9 ventilation system may have been operational a year ago.
10 So that means that a year ago people could have breathed
11 in or ingested dust from the overhead vents that had
12 radionuclides on it.

13 The other thing that I want to emphasize to
14 everyone is that Laurie has made clear the cesium and
15 the radium that's been found in the vents and in the
16 drains is above background. This is not, you know,
17 nuclear fallout. It is not cosmic radiation or an act
18 of God. This is contamination. It is slightly above
19 background. So it is therefore significant.

20 And then Mr. Terzian also expressed his
21 concerns that the exhaust ventilation system is not
22 contained and that the artists had lingering questions
23 about the risk of inhaling and ingesting the
24 radionuclides detected on the survey.

25 Now, the final thing that I want to say is that

Page 98

1 I had raised the issue of the need for radiation risk
2 assessment for Parcel D because there are other human
3 occupants. There are other artists on Parcel B.

4 And HRA has generated a radiation risk
5 assessment for Parcel E. and, you know, Laurie and --
6 and Keith Forman, you know, they, you know, made some --
7 some explanations for why it hadn't been done. I was
8 impressed to read here under "Parcel D September 2003
9 Activities" "Continue human health risk assessment data
10 evaluation."

11 So if they're going to do -- if you're going to
12 do a human health risk assessment for Parcel D, then
13 since there are human occupants on Parcel D, I think
14 that we should have a radiation risk assessment. It
15 just seems to me to be a commonsense measure that we
16 should have some mathematical model for determining, you
17 know, using a computer methodology of what the risks are
18 for people who are on this site.

19 So that is as much as I am going to say, and
20 you can review the -- you know, the meeting minutes with
21 much more thoroughness.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

23 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. I would like to make a
24 couple of statements. Yes, we had a great meeting
25 yesterday. I thought it went really well.

Page 99

1 And please, if people have concerns,
2 radiological concerns, that they would like more
3 information on, we'd love to talk to you at the RAB
4 subcommittee meetings. Those kind of have a different
5 atmosphere, and you get more one-on-one questioning.
6 It -- We can answer in a little more detail.

7 Also, as far as the California bills that are
8 pending, that is also one of my taskings for reviewing
9 those all the time. We are looking at the different
10 levels. The NRC level that they are challenging is a
11 dose-base 25-millirem level. EPA is coming back with a
12 risk-base level of 10 to the minus 6 or even
13 15 millirem.

14 There's different ways to look at this. Navy
15 has a certain stance. They do not agree with the
16 25-millirem rule. The reg. guide 1.86 comes out with a
17 different level that is lower than 25 millirem.

18 So we are really trying to accommodate what the
19 future bills would be as well as working with Cal. DHS
20 to meet their standards. So there's kind of like a
21 compromise going on. Everybody's trying to do that.

22 And then in addition to that, all of the
23 readings are compared, as is required by the
24 Multi-Agency Survey and Site Investigation Manual, the
25 MARSSIM. So all buildings are -- and readings are

Page 100

1 analyzed for the proper statistical variance and
2 analytical processes that are required by that
3 regulation. So I wanted to let you all know that too.
4 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Harrison has
5 a question, then Mr. Manuel, and then we have an
6 audience question.
7 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
8 MS. HARRISON: Real quickly. Actually, one of
9 my questions Ahimsa actually addressed.
10 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
11 MS. HARRISON: So I can let that go for now.
12 But what's really important to me is that you
13 had said that the Army Corps of Engineers wanted to be
14 involved in this process now?
15 MS. LOWMAN: In that HRA review process?
16 MS. HARRISON: Uh-huh.
17 MS. LOWMAN: Uh-huh.
18 MS. HARRISON: Could that possibly be because
19 they know that the Army has actually dumped stuff over
20 there in this Parcel E?
21 MS. LOWMAN: The gentleman --
22 MS. HARRISON: Let me finish.
23 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
24 MS. HARRISON: That they have dumped stuff over
25 here, especially stuff after the closure of the -- of

Page 101

1 the Presidio and stuff. I'm told that may have come
2 from the hospital, and the Navy doesn't seem to know
3 what it is.
4 And would they actually have records of what
5 was brought here and dumped and buried in Parcel E that
6 we might be able to review or you may be able to review?
7 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. That's the first I've heard
8 of the Army dumping anything on Parcel E.
9 We are looking for radiological records.
10 Gentleman with the Army Corps of Engineers is Mr. Jerry
11 Vincent that's going to be the reviewer. He is the one
12 responsible for Buildings 815, 820 -- 820, I believe it
13 is, 830, and 831. Those areas are FUDS sites, or
14 Formerly Used Defense Sites, which fall under his
15 jurisdiction. And the HRA covers the radiological
16 operations at those sites.
17 So he is interested in seeing what history we
18 found.
19 And we also in the document categorized the
20 types of migration of any residual radioactivity that
21 there might be, and we make a recommendation for future
22 actions for each of the sites. So he is very interested
23 in seeing what -- what the history is that we have found
24 for those buildings, what was used in those buildings,
25 and what our recommendation is. That's why he's

Page 102

1 involved.
2 So I -- I'm not aware of any Army dumping of
3 any type of waste over there. That's the first time
4 I've heard of that.
5 MS. HARRISON: Well, that actually came -- came
6 to my attention a couple years back.
7 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
8 MS. HARRISON: And you have to know that I've
9 been sitting on this RAB for at least -- what, 12 years
10 now?
11 MR. ATTENDEE: Twelve.
12 MS. HARRISON: Eleven, twelve years? I'm quite
13 possibly the oldest person sitting here on the table.
14 Well, not being the oldest person in the building.
15 MS. LOWMAN: The oldest RAB member?
16 MS. HARRISON: No, that's not right either.
17 MR. TISDELL: You want to say RAB member --
18 MS. LOWMAN: The oldest -- the oldest -- The
19 person who has served on the RAB the longest?
20 MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.
21 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
22 MS. HARRISON: Quite possibly. I would
23 actually put some money on it.
24 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
25 MS. HARRISON: So when that -- when that

Page

1 actually came to light, no one ever went back after we
2 requested go back and ask them. I know that the Army
3 keeps records just like the Navy does.
4 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
5 MS. HARRISON: I happened to work with the
6 Department of the Navy as a civilian, and I couldn't get
7 a pencil unless I filled out the form in triplicates. I
8 know that the Navy is very similar. The Army is very
9 similar. Air force is very similar. They just -- They
10 love paperwork.
11 So somebody has to know, one, if in fact that
12 they did, they dumped stuff over here before the closure
13 of the Presidio or afterwards, and it has to be in
14 writing somewhere.
15 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. But you are saying that
16 this is in general material that they brought over from
17 there --
18 MS. HARRISON: Actually --
19 MS. LOWMAN: -- or do you think it has to do
20 with radiological --
21 MS. HARRISON: It --
22 MS. LOWMAN: -- material?
23 MS. HARRISON: -- possibly would have to do --
24 If they have used these -- If these radiological
25 materials were used at all, these radium dials or

Page 104

1 anything like that that was used at all in the hospital,
2 then it would probably be along those lines, yes.
3 MS. LOWMAN: So you are talking about Oak Knoll
4 Hospital?
5 MS. HARRISON: No.
6 MR. ATTENDEE: Letterman.
7 MS. LOWMAN: Letterman, okay.
8 MS. HARRISON: I am talking about Letterman,
9 okay.
10 MS. PIERCE: The old marine -- the old marine
11 hospital, which was shut down and not cleaned until
12 after transfer.
13 MS. HARRISON: Exactly.
14 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
15 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So --
16 MS. LOWMAN: I will -- I will see if there's
17 information out there. I don't -- I can't guarantee it
18 that I'll have it if it's not radiological, you know.
19 MS. OLIVA: Medical waste.
20 MS. HARRISON: But it's medical waste.
21 MS. ATTENDEE: It's medical waste.
22 MS. LOWMAN: It depends on if they had a
23 nuclear medicine department. So --
24 MS. HARRISON: I don't know if they give x-rays
25 back -- back then, that tells me -- and they did.

Page 105

1 MS. LOWMAN: Well, I know, but that --
2 MS. HARRISON: What did they do with the waste
3 product from that, the old equipment?
4 MS. LOWMAN: Right, but that is electric,
5 electrical, and it doesn't leave a residue.
6 MS. HARRISON: [Unintelligible interruption] --
7 open the door for you?
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: One -- one person can speak
9 at a time, please.
10 MS. HARRISON: To me it doesn't matter. It
11 opens the door for you to ask those questions --
12 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
13 MS. HARRISON: -- and see the documents.
14 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. I will see what I can do.
15 MS. HARRISON: Thank you.
16 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Harrison, do you want
18 this as an action item to be --
19 MS. HARRISON: Yes.
20 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- followed up on?
21 MS. HARRISON: Yes.
22 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
23 MS. PENDERGRASS: All rightie, then.
24 Mr. Manual.
25 MR. MANUEL: Okay. Is it on? Oh, it is on.

Page 106

1 First off, I think in all fairness to basically
2 all the participants that come to these meetings, that
3 we should assume that the people that participate, be
4 they people on the RAB board or -- or the public
5 at-large, have -- the people that come here have enough
6 integrity to be interested in helping resolve whatever's
7 going on and raise issues and whatever. And I think in
8 all fairness, every single person here is due that kind
9 of respect.
10 And I believe unless we go and find a smoking
11 gun of somebody deliberately intentionally lying to us,
12 that we should give everyone the benefit of the doubt
13 rather -- whether they're regulators, whether they're
14 people at-large in the public or et cetera.
15 Now, one of the issues I wanted to raise is
16 that it was mentioned earlier about the dust particles
17 flying all over the place. Well, I happen to know that
18 Arc Ecology and a lot of the other people in the
19 community know very well that Firma operated an illegal
20 concrete crushing plant here for years. It has asbestos
21 in concrete. It has a whole lot of other airborne
22 problems. And I don't hear anybody complaining about
23 Firma. So let's be fair about this.
24 They are exposed because they didn't have a
25 federal license. They didn't have a state license to

Page 107

1 operate that crushing plant. Okay? Let's -- let's look
2 at the whole picture here and what's right is right, and
3 let's be fair about this.
4 Secondly, I wanted to refresh Mr. Tompkins'
5 memory, but he may have left early, though, last week --
6 last month. Excuse me.
7 What we all agree, at least I thought we all
8 agreed, is that being that the Navy has not put forward
9 their plan, they have not gotten any okays or -- or --
10 okays to go forward to do anything.
11 There is a process. We discussed this at the
12 last meeting, that nothing will be agreed to that they
13 will do or process they will do or anything else until
14 the public, this RAB board, and anyone else participates
15 in that process. There's nothing that's just going to
16 come up out of the woods and just say: "Here. Here we
17 are. This is what we're going to do." The law doesn't
18 allow them to do that. We did discuss this at the last
19 meeting.
20 So they can't just move forward without us
21 participating. Okay?
22 Now, beyond that, I'd like to ask you on the
23 behalf of the Navy and/or the Redevelopment Agency -- I
24 know that there's disclaimers all over this base about
25 this being a toxic site and there may be problems and et

Page 108

1 cetera, et cetera -- pure, right out, is the facilities
2 that the artists occupy -- are those facilities safe for
3 human occupation or not?
4 If they are not safe for human occupation, why
5 are these people being put in the potential position of
6 harm?
7 We need to know whether or not it's -- it's
8 safe for people to be in there or not, and -- because a
9 lot of these questions that are coming up basically
10 suggest that people are kind of in there and no one's
11 bothered to check whether or not they are safe being at
12 these places or not.
13 And I'd like an answer for that, because in all
14 fairness, there's a whole lot of exposure -- legal
15 exposure here if somebody -- I guess agreement with them
16 is with the Redevelopment Agency? That's who sublet the
17 thing out to these people?
18 So, I mean, somebody needed to take them some
19 kind of notice of this situation and be able to assure
20 them it's safe. If it's not, they shouldn't be in
21 there.
22 MR. BROWN: That's right.
23 MR. MANUEL: Simple as that. So I'd like an
24 answer to that.
25 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. I can -- I can understand

Page 109

1 completely what you're saying. And we are -- if you're
2 talking about radiological hazard?
3 MR. MANUEL: Any kind of hazard.
4 MS. LOWMAN: Any type of hazard.
5 MR. MANUEL: Any type of hazard.
6 MS. LOWMAN: At 366 or any of the artists'
7 buildings?
8 MR. MANUEL: Any of the occupied territories.
9 Anyplace where anybody's breathing anything or walking
10 around in there or anything else is -- is it safe for
11 these people or not?
12 MS. LOWMAN: Do you want to take this one?
13 Radiologically I can address this, but --
14 MR. FORMAN: You do your part first.
15 MS. LOWMAN: Do my part first?
16 MR. FORMAN: Yeah.
17 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. Radiologically we are
18 investigating every site on this base that we feel by
19 virtue of all the research we have done -- and it will
20 be documented in the HRA -- had potential for any
21 residual radioactivity.
22 We have looked at some of the artists'
23 buildings already, and there are -- we have asked one
24 other individual to move out of the building when we
25 discovered some residual contamination in it. That was

Page 110

1 at Building 364. I believe he was a metal processor
2 that was in there, and he has been relocated to another
3 site.
4 MR. BROWN: Is that 320?
5 MS. LOWMAN: 364. It was 364. Okay.
6 As far as any other building that we have done
7 surveys in, we have not yet found any evidence of
8 radiological contamination other than 366 where we had
9 people in the buildings and working in the buildings.
10 We have found it in 364, and we asked that individual to
11 relocate.
12 And 366, that levels we found in 366, we do not
13 consider them to be harmful at all. However, for us to
14 do the remediation and the decontamination in the
15 building would be absolutely crazy for us to have the
16 people in there, 'cause we are going to have to move
17 their work spaces.
18 We are going to have to -- The ceiling is
19 35 feet high with the ventilation in it that we are
20 going to rip holes in the ceiling, rip pipes up out of
21 the concrete floor. It would be very, very difficult
22 for us to do that.
23 So for -- not only for radiological purposes,
24 but just general safety precautions, we would want them
25 to vacate that building.

Page

1 I have no other impacted site that I am aware
2 of at this time that has any tenants in it, and we are
3 checking that all the time as we are doing the research
4 that we are doing.
5 Now, as far as other contaminants, I would have
6 to defer to Mr. Forman.
7 MR. MANUEL: Well -- well, you know, very
8 briefly --
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mi- --
10 MR. MANUEL: -- here, well, very briefly --
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Manuel?
12 MR. MANUEL: -- I -- my -- my question was,
13 basically: Was there consideration prior to allowing
14 the people to occupy these buildings more importantly
15 than what's happening now, they say -- or whatever, but
16 was there a basic consideration prior to allowing the
17 people to occupy the buildings whether or not they were
18 deemed to be safe for human occupation?
19 That's my basic question, and I may have
20 misstated it. That's why I'm trying to clean it up. I
21 don't mean to interrupt, but that's the question I
22 wanted is that was -- you know, was there consideration
23 before the people were allowed to occupy these buildings
24 whether or not they were safe or not, or this is kind of
25 an after-the-fact thing, horse is galloping down the

Page 112

1 valley, and you shut the gate now?
2 MS. LOWMAN: Well --
3 MR. MANUEL: I mean, that's what I want to
4 know.
5 MS. LOWMAN: It's kind of a -- if you're
6 talking about, for example, we use 366 as an example.
7 336 was used by NRDL for various purposes.
8 When they vacated that building -- well, when they used
9 it, it was No. 351 B. When they vacated that building,
10 they did all the proper surveys for that time. They did
11 everything they were supposed to do with the
12 instrumentation --
13 MR. MANUEL: Okay.
14 MS. LOWMAN: -- they had available.
15 MR. MANUEL: That's what I want to know.
16 MS. LOWMAN: Okay. And the Shipyard took that
17 building over and used it as a boat and plastic shop.
18 The Shipyard workers were in there working for the rest
19 of the time.
20 But as far as any regulator was concerned,
21 that -- radiological regulator, the Atomic Energy
22 Commission, that building had been released to the
23 standards at the time. It was free released, and there
24 was no reason anyone couldn't occupy it.
25 MR. MANUEL: So it was turned over to the

Page 113

1 Redevelopment at that time?
2 MS. LOWMAN: Well, after the Shipyard closed
3 and Triple A was no longer using the building, my
4 understanding is that they were leased to the San
5 Francisco Redevelopment Authority.
6 MR. MANUEL: When the bui- -- When -- when the
7 property in question was turned over to Redevelopment,
8 there were fresh surveys at the time?
9 MS. LOWMAN: No.
10 MR. FORMAN: No.
11 MS. LOWMAN: They based -- They turned those
12 buildings over based on the historical information.
13 Since that time, we have new standards and
14 instrumentation. We also have new standards -- new
15 release standards, radiological release standards, for
16 those buildings. That is why we are doing the HRA.
17 That is why we are going back to address any site that
18 potentially was impacted by radiological operations so
19 that we can revisit all of these old surveys.
20 And some of these buildings were surveyed
21 multiple times. Some of these buildings were
22 surveyed -- 364, as an example, was surveyed by RASO in
23 1978 and '79, and we released it.
24 And now RASO is saying, "Hey, there's -- we
25 have got to go back and look at it again." There was

Page 114

1 contamination that was below the new s- -- or above, I
2 should say, the new standards that we did not remove,
3 and we have gone back and worked in that building, and
4 now it meets the current standards.
5 So --
6 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
7 MS. LOWMAN: -- some of what we are doing now
8 is to revisit these sites to make sure.
9 Ten years ago when 366 was leased, I'm sure
10 that it met the standards of that time.
11 MR. MANUEL: Yeah, that's what I basically
12 wanted to know.
13 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
15 MS. LOWMAN: Does that help?
16 MR. MANUEL: Yeah, thank you.
17 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.
18 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Now, now, we have --
19 we have another question from the audience there, and
20 then --
21 MR. BROWN: I had a question.
22 MS. PENDERGRASS: And then we have a question
23 from you. Just a minute.
24 MS. PIERCE: Tom?
25 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

Page 115

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: You've been very patient.
2 Yes, sir.
3 MR. RIPLEY: Talofa, Laurie, thank you for the
4 opportunity and also the RAB committee.
5 Two question that I have tonight is -- one --
6 Oh, by the way, my name is Seali'imalietoa Sam
7 Ripley from the Samoan Community here in Bayview-Hunters
8 Point. I been here. I'm originally from Samoa, born
9 and raised in Samoa, but was new here in Hunters Point
10 in the Bayview for quite some time.
11 The question is: You, the Navy, fail --
12 f-a-l-e [sic], fail -- to reach to the Samoan community
13 where they 40 percent of the -- you haven't done -- you
14 haven't did your assign- -- your homework. You need to
15 outreach --
16 How are you doing your outreach to the Pacific
17 Islander Samoan Community?
18 MS. PENDERGRASS: Excuse me. I have to stop
19 your question at this point because our question period
20 at this point is about the presentation about --
21 MR. RIPLEY: Okay. Well, it's linked up to
22 this -- can I make my question? I -- I been waiting
23 faithfully.
24 The question is: How are you translating the
25 material? We are not informed. That's very important.

Page 116

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
2 MR. RIPLEY: That the Navy, since 1900, they
3 came to the -- the highest cancer reach. They just left
4 a mess in the South Pacific. You know that. And you're
5 not informing the Samoan community here up in the
6 Hunters Point, which is the -- the highest is
7 African-American. For your information, Laurie --
8 MR. FORMAN: Sir.
9 MR. RIPLEY: -- the second is Samoan community.
10 Thank you very much for your --
11 MR. FORMAN: Sir --
12 MR. RIPLEY: -- time, and I am glad I am --
13 MR. FORMAN: Okay.
14 MR. RIPLEY: -- here.
15 MR. FORMAN: Let --
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
17 MR. FORMAN: Let me give you a quick response
18 to that, sir.
19 What I recommend -- You sound like a good
20 cons- -- solid, concerned citizen. Talk to me after the
21 RAB.
22 We have been doing a lot. If you come to the
23 RAB meetings; if you -- if you heard about us before,
24 you know that we're doing a lot in a lot of different
25 communities.

Page 117

1 One -- one RAB member -- I don't believe he's
2 here tonight -- his name is Mr. Sulu Palega. Are you
3 familiar with him?
4 MR. RIPLEY: Very familiar with him. But, you
5 know, this is a first time I -- I -- not the first time.
6 I take that back. But you are not outreaching out in
7 the -- the community.
8 MR. FORMAN: Okay. So --
9 MR. RIPLEY: That's all I have to say.
10 MR. FORMAN: Okay. So my recommendation is
11 that after the meeting adjourns here, if you could stay
12 and talk with me, we can begin that outreach, and I will
13 also talk to you about incorporating the RAB member here
14 who's supposed to be a great facilitator. That's Sulu
15 Palega, and we'll talk about that after the meeting.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.
17 All right. Lynne.
18 MR. BROWN: Yes, thank you.
19 I like to say, there's a lot of stuff that NRDL
20 was doing out there on the Shipyard, and it's a lot of
21 stuff in 1969 when Atomic Energy Commission came out
22 there and removed strontium-90, cesium 130 -- they
23 removed a lot of stuff out from the NRDL building.
24 What -- what I would like to ask is: Can we
25 get a inventory of everything that they moved out --

Page 118

1 removed from the NRDL building in 1969?
2 MS. LOWMAN: The reference documents for the
3 HRA, we have right now over 4,000 documents that we are
4 sorting through as to what we are using as reference
5 documents for the HRA. One of those documents is the
6 list of radioactive sources and where they were
7 transferred to that NRDL had when they moved and --
8 MR. BROWN: Right.
9 MS. LOWMAN: -- where they transferred those
10 sources to. I will try and make sure that that is
11 included in the reference list.
12 It would -- The references are going to be so
13 large that they will only be available on CD because
14 there's just so many of them. So we will try to make
15 sure it's included.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. And thank you for
17 your presentation tonight.
18 MS. LOWMAN: Okay?
19 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. At this point --
20 Thank you so much.
21 (Applause.)
22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. At this point tonight,
23 it is -- I have twenty minutes to 9 o'clock. We are way
24 long. Excuse me.
25 So at this point, what -- what I'd like to do

Page 119

1 is: We have committee reports. Most of those are in
2 writing. What I would like to ask at this point is if
3 we could get up the dates of the next meetings, and we
4 can put that up right now.
5 We can -- Anybody who has a motion from their
6 committee report that needs to be brought to the full
7 RAB, we will take those now and then adjourn the meeting
8 and any subsequent things.
9 Is there someone who just deathly opposes that
10 option? Someone who opposes that option?
11 All right. So who's the first committee that
12 has a moving motion that they need to make as part of
13 tonight's agenda?
14 Mr. Tisdell?
15 MR. TISDELL: Yes.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: And then Miss Pierce.
17 MR. TISDELL: Good evening. There's -- I like
18 to place a motion on the floor to accept Mr. Charles
19 Dracus [sic] as a renewal candidate for the RAB.
20 Mr. Charles Dacus.
21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there a motion, sir?
22 Please --
23 MR. TISDELL: I formed it in a motion.
24 MR. RAB MEMBER: I second it.
25 MS. PIERCE: Second.

Page 120

1 MR. RAB MEMBER: I second it.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We have a second
3 to that motion.
4 All in favor of bringing Mr. Charles Duck --
5 Duckus?
6 MR. DACUS: Dacus.
7 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Dacus back as a RAB member
8 in good standing, all in favor, say, "Aye."
9 THE BOARD: Aye.
10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Anyone opposed?
11 And any abstentions to that?
12 (No verbal response elicited.)
13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. We have --
14 Welcome back --
15 MR. DACUS: Thank you.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Mr. Dacus.
17 MR. TISDELL: And -- and also this is just to
18 let the RAB know that Miss Caroline Washington and
19 Mr. Sulu Palegra [sic] will be removed from the RAB due
20 to the misses.
21 MR. ATTENDEE: Yeah.
22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
23 MR. TISDELL: That's just, you know.
24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.
25 MR. TISDELL: And Ron can handle that.

Page 121

1 since it has already started the process for reviewing
2 the lease, the -- the police department lease, to
3 consider expanding that so that we can -- There's --
4 There is participation and then there's participation.
5 We want a real participatory process. So we'd like to
6 request that that be included as part of what you're
7 already doing.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: There's no need to respond to
9 that at this time. You could do that --
10 MR. TISDELL: Yes --
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- off line.
12 MR. TISDELL: -- it -- it is --
13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there --?
14 MR. TISDELL: -- because Mr. Don Capobres will
15 be there November the 5th.
16 MR. FORMAN: Yes.
17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. All right. Thank you,
18 sir. Thank you so much.
19 Do we have all the dates for the Radiological
20 Committee meeting next week, please?
21 MS. SUMCHAI: When is Thanksgiving in November?
22 MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry.
23 MS. SUMCHAI: Is it the 20 -- next --?
24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Just a moment. I'm sorry.
25 Mr. Campbell, did you have a moving motion?

Page 123

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Pierce?
2 MR. BROWN: May I say this? They allowed to
3 reapply too.
4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.
5 MR. TISDELL: They could reapply.
6 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.
7 Miss Pierce?
8 MS. PIERCE: This was going to be a request;
9 but if I put it in the form of a motion, then I will --
10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Can you speak --
11 MS. PIERCE: Well --
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- up? Or you can use --
13 MS. PIERCE: Okay.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- a mike.
15 MS. PIERCE: This was going to be just a
16 request, but I will put it in the form of a motion.
17 The Risk Review Committee is recommending that
18 a full participatory process be established to look at
19 the leasing agreements the San Francisco Redevelopment
20 Agency enters into to ensure that there -- there's clear
21 delineation of responsibilities and consequences. And
22 in order to do that, we have identified a number of
23 other city departments that should be included in the
24 discussion.

25 We'd like to ask if the Outreach Committee,

Page 122

1 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I do.
2 There's Section 2912 of the -- the -- the F --
3 the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act
4 establishing the following preference for businesses
5 located in the vicinity of base closure and realignment
6 work.
7 Now, what my understanding is, the Navy is
8 going to start putting this in their RFPS. The law is
9 here. I believe all the RAB members have it. It was
10 challenged, I believe, in 2000. It was enforced by the
11 GAO, and we would like to see this -- a motion to have
12 this enforced in the future.
13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So the RA -- your --
14 okay. The -- the way this works is: The RAB can -- you
15 can move -- put a motion together that say -- that gets
16 the RAB in full agreement to make a recommendation to
17 the Navy. But that's about how that works.
18 MR. CAMPBELL: That's fine.
19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Did you want to state
20 that motion?
21 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah. I would like to make --
22 I'm sorry. I would like to make a recommendation
23 that --

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: It's a motion.

25 MR. CAMPBELL: -- a motion that this body back

Page 124

1 Section 2912 of the FY 1994 Defense Authorization Act,
2 Publication 1.103-116, establishing the following
3 preference of business located in the vicinity of base
4 closure and realignment.
5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.
6 Did we have a second to that?
7 MR. TOMPKINS: Second.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Second.
9 And all in favor of the motion as -- as read,
10 say, "Aye."
11 THE BOARD: Aye.
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Anyone opposed to that
13 motion?
14 Any abstentions to that motion?
15 (No verbal response elicited.)
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So that's a
17 recommendation. Did you --? Did your committee want to
18 put that recommendation in writing, Mr. Campbell?
19 MR. CAMPBELL: We can.
20 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. That would make sense.
21 MR. TOMPKINS: I have a copy here.
22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. That would make sense.
23 MR. FORMAN: Have you been working with
24 Mr. Chon Son on this?
25 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

Page 125

1 MR. FORMAN: Okay.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Did we want to
3 put that as an action item as follow-up --
4 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes.
5 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- or how do you want to do
6 that?
7 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry. I didn't hear.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Did we want to put that as an
9 action item for follow-up?
10 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.
11 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes.
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. So that would be
13 an action item for next time too to follow up just to
14 see what we are going to do with it. Gives you time to
15 respond.
16 All right. Barring there's nothing else --
17 MR. BROWN: I've got announcement.
18 MR. DA COSTA: Public comment.
19 MR. BROWN: I got announcement. I have meeting
20 dates. We don't have all the dates yet.
21 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. I'm so sorry.
22 I'm in a hurry, as you can see.
23 All right. Okay. We have Radiological meeting
24 on November 19th. When's the Membership & Bylaws?
25 November 6th. We've got Technical Review November what?

Page 126

1 MS. LOIZOS: 18.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: 18.
3 MR. ATTENDEE: Where?
4 MS. LOIZOS: At the Community Window on the
5 Shipyard, which is 4634 Third Street opening on the 7th.
6 There are invitations for all of you on the -- on the
7 table there with the location address.
8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. And then the final
9 committee --?
10 MR. MALOOF: At what time?
11 MS. LOIZOS: 6:00.
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Which committee did I forget?
13 MR. TOMPKINS: Risk Assessment.
14 MS. PENDERGRASS: Risk Assessment Committee.
15 MS. PIERCE: Joint meeting.
16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Joint meeting.
17 MS. LOIZOS: And it will be with the Tech
18 Subcommittee.
19 MS. PENDERGRASS: With the Tech Subcommittee.
20 MS. PIERCE: With the Tech Subcommittee, and we
21 will be working with the Outreach Committee on the other
22 piece of our --
23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.
24 MS. PIERCE: -- proposed activity.
25 MR. CAMPBELL: One more thing.

Page 127

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.
2 MR. TOMPKINS: Economic.
3 MR. CAMPBELL: Economic Committee November 11th
4 at 2:30 at the Anna Waden Library.
5 MR. ATTENDEE: Veterans Day.
6 MR. BROOKS: Veterans Day.
7 MS. PENDERGRASS: November 11th is Veterans
8 Day.
9 MR. CAMPBELL: Oh.
10 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.
11 MR. ATTENDEE: So --
12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Will you -- will you get with
13 Mr. Keichline with a new date --
14 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I will.
15 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- for that? Okay.
16 MR. BROWN: I got announcement.
17 MS. PENDERGRASS: And then we have one
18 announcement.
19 MR. BROWN: On the 29th at 6 o'clock at the
20 Southeast Community facility, we'll be having
21 Environmental Racism Workshop pertaining to the
22 Southeast Sewage Treatment Plant.
23 So everybody, if you don't have one, here's an
24 invitation to it.
25 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

Page 128

1 Yes, sir?
2 Okay. I'd like to say thank you for going long
3 tonight. This has been an extremely productive meeting.
4 We got a lot done.
5 And I would suggest that next month,
6 Mr. Keichline, if -- if we're going to have two big
7 reports like that, then we need to schedule till 8:30.
8 MR. DA COSTA: And no public comment?
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: We really don't want to have
10 any public comment because we want to go home. But
11 Mr. Da Costa, you come every meeting, please feel free.
12 MR. DA COSTA: I think I been listening --
13 yeah, thank you. I been listening very carefully, and I
14 have a very brief comment.
15 I have -- There are certain state regulators
16 here, and we'll be monitoring your observations in the
17 future, because we have a lot of discussion here.
18 One of the reasons the artists were put there
19 were because of political reasons, Nancy Pelosi's
20 legislation. And right now, the community is going to
21 bear adversely due to certain political pressure put to
22 build 1,600 units.
23 So the city has a precautionary principle, and
24 I'm inviting the state regulators over here to monitor
25 this process very carefully.

Page 129


1 Thank you.
2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Mr. Costa.
3 We are adjourned.
4 (Off record at 8:45 p.m., 10/23/03.)
5 ---oOo---

Page 130

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify
that the foregoing meeting was reported by me
stenographically to the best of my ability at the time
and place aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand
this 4th day of December, 2003


CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, C.S.R. NO. 4569

Page 131

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT

AUGUST 2003

This monthly progress report (MPR) summarizes environmental restoration activities conducted by the Navy at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) during August 2003. This MPR is prepared in accordance with the HPS Federal Facility Agreement, Section 6.6. The MPR is presented in three sections: Section 1, Parcel Updates, summarizes key activities at each parcel completed during the past month and planned for the upcoming 2 months; Section 2, Schedule, identifies submittals, meetings, and field activities completed during the past month and planned for the upcoming 2 months; Section 3, Other, is intended for special announcements, changes in personnel, basewide issues, or other topics not included in Sections 1 or 2.

1.0 PARCEL UPDATES

PARCEL B AUGUST 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepared and submitted final Building 123 soil vapor extraction (SVE) confirmation study summary report with responses to comments (RTC).
- Prepared and submitted final January – March 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report.
- Prepared and submitted draft April – June 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report.
- Conducted meeting to discuss agency comments on the draft construction summary report. Continued preparation of RTCs.
- Conducted July – September 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring.
- Installed wells associated with Building 123 Ferox injection treatability study.

PARCEL B SEPTEMBER 2003 – OCTOBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Continue preparing RTCs for the draft construction summary report.
- Prepare and submit shoreline data gaps technical memorandum.
- Prepare RTCs for the groundwater evaluation technical memorandum.
- Prepare and submit work plan for follow-on SVE treatability study in Building 123.

- Prepare and submit draft final five-year review document with RTCs. Conduct public meeting to solicit input from the community.
- Continue preparation of technical memorandum to support the proposed record of decision (ROD) amendment. Resolve risk assessment technical issues and identify applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements for technical memorandum and proposed ROD amendment.
- Prepare final April – June 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report, pending receipt and resolution of agency comments.
- Prepare final work plan for the Building 123 Ferox injection treatability study with RTCs (study also to include work at Parcel C, Building 272). Begin baseline sampling.

PARCEL C AUGUST 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepared and submitted final report with RTCs for Phase III Groundwater Data Gaps Investigation (GDGI) activities at Parcel C.
- Prepared and submitted work plan for Dry Dock 4 water sampling and debris removal. The proposed work is required for Dry Dock 4 to be in the same condition as Dry Docks 2 and 3 (with the caisson tied off at the head of the dry dock).
- Continued waste consolidation work.

PARCEL C SEPTEMBER 2003 – OCTOBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare and submit draft work plan for sequential anaerobic/aerobic bioremediation treatability study in Building 134.
- Continue waste consolidation work.
- Prepare and submit final work plan for follow-on Ferox injection treatability study at Building 272 (study also to include work at Parcel B, Building 123). Install supplemental monitoring wells and begin baseline sampling.

PARCEL D AUGUST 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Evaluated radiation screening survey results from Building 366.
- Prepared and submitted RTCs for Parcel D waste consolidation post-construction report.

PARCEL D SEPTEMBER 2003 – OCTOBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare action memorandum and work plan for Parcel D removal actions.
- Continue human health risk assessment data evaluation.
- Address radiation screening survey results from Building 366.

PARCEL E AUGUST 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepared and submitted draft report for landfill liquefaction potential.
- Prepared and submitted final wetlands delineation report with RTCs.
- Continued monitoring of the landfill gas control system. Performed maintenance activities at barrier wall to ensure effective performance of landfill gas control system.
- Continued waste consolidation work.
- Continued operation of groundwater extraction system at industrial landfill.

PARCEL E SEPTEMBER 2003 – OCTOBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare work plan for the IR-02 removal action (to be performed under the basewide radiation removal action).
- Prepare and submit final report with RTCs for Phase III GDGI activities at Parcel E.
- Prepare draft workplan for phyto-groundwater extraction treatability study at the industrial landfill.
- Prepare final landfill cap removal action closeout report with RTCs.
- Prepare final landfill gas characterization report with RTCs.
- Prepare RTCs for landfill extent report.
- Prepare final landfill liquefaction potential report with RTCs, pending receipt and resolution of agency comments.
- Prepare draft shoreline characterization technical memorandum for the standard data gaps investigation.
- Prepare interim data analysis document for Phases 1 and 2 of the standard data gaps investigation.

- Prepare draft landfill gas removal action closeout report.
- Continue monitoring the landfill gas control system.
- Continue radiation screening surveys based on the findings of the historic radiological assessment (HRA).
- Continue waste consolidation work.
- Continue operation of groundwater extraction system at industrial landfill.

PARCEL F AUGUST 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepared and submitted work plan for data gaps investigation to support the feasibility study.
- Continued preparation of responses to remainder of agency comments on draft validation study (VS) report.

PARCEL F SEPTEMBER 2003 – OCTOBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare RTCs for the data gaps investigation work plan, pending receipt and resolution of agency comments. Perform field work for data gaps investigation, and prepare field summary report.
- Continue preparation of responses to remainder of agency comments on draft VS report. Prepare draft final VS report.

2.0 SCHEDULE

This section presents meetings and deliverables conducted and planned during this reporting period.

Activities Conducted	Date
Submitted draft Parcel E landfill liquefaction potential report	August 1, 2003
Submitted final January – March 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report	August 12, 2003
Submitted final Parcel E wetlands delineation report with RTCs	August 14, 2003
Submitted final Parcel B SVE confirmation study summary report with RTCs	August 19, 2003
Parcel B construction summary report meeting	August 19, 2003
Submitted draft work plan for Parcel F data gaps investigation	August 21, 2003
Submitted RTCs for draft Parcel D waste consolidation summary report	August 21, 2003
Submitted draft April – June 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report	August 22, 2003
BCT monthly meeting	August 26, 2003

Activities Conducted	Date
RAB meeting	August 28, 2003
Submitted final Parcel C GDGI report with RTCs	August 29, 2003

Activities Planned	Date
Basewide groundwater monitoring plan meeting	September 3, 2003
Submit draft final five-year review document with RTCs	September 22, 2003
BCT monthly meeting	September 23, 2003
RAB meeting	September 25, 2003
Submit draft work plan for follow-on SVE treatability study at Building 123	September 26, 2003
Submit draft work plan for sequential anaerobic/aerobic biological treatability study at Building 134	October 2, 2003
Submit draft final community involvement plan	October 2, 2003
Submit draft Parcel B shoreline data gaps technical memorandum	October 3, 2003
Submit final Parcel E GDGI report with RTCs	October 17, 2003
BCT monthly meeting	October 21, 2003
RAB meeting	October 23, 2003

Note:

- * Document submittal pending receipt and/or resolution of BCT comments

3.0 OTHER

- The Navy is continuing to prepare the draft final HRA, which is planned for submittal in early 2004.
- The Navy submitted the draft base realignment and closure (BRAC) business plan on April 2, 2003. The Navy and regulatory agencies are working to resolve comments on the draft BRAC business plan.
- The draft community involvement plan (CIP, formerly referred to as the community relations plan) was submitted on June 6, 2003. The BCT and public review period for the draft CIP was extended until August 12, 2003. The draft final CIP is planned for submittal on October 2, 2003.
- The Navy is preparing a basewide groundwater monitoring plan that is planned for submittal in November 2003. A document scoping meeting was held on June 10, 2003, and a follow-on meeting was held on September 3, 2003.
- The Navy submitted a drinking water determination letter applicable to Parcels B, C, D, and E to the Regional Water Quality Control Board on August 11, 2003.

- The Navy conducted a basewide inventory of stockpiles at HPS. The Navy will complete this inventory and evaluate necessary response actions.

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2003

This monthly progress report (MPR) summarizes environmental restoration activities conducted by the Navy at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) during September 2003. This MPR is prepared in accordance with the HPS Federal Facility Agreement, Section 6.6. The MPR is presented in three sections: Section 1, Parcel Updates, summarizes key activities at each parcel completed during the past month and planned for the upcoming 2 months; Section 2, Schedule, identifies submittals, meetings, and field activities completed during the past month and planned for the upcoming 2 months; Section 3, Other, is intended for special announcements, changes in personnel, basewide issues, or other topics not included in Sections 1 or 2.

1.0 PARCEL UPDATES

PARCEL B SEPTEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepared and submitted draft work plan for follow-on soil vapor extraction (SVE) treatability study in Building 123.
- Prepared and submitted draft final five-year review document with responses to comments (RTC). Conducted public meeting to solicit input from the community.
- Prepared final work plan for the Building 123 Ferox injection treatability study with RTCs (previously included work at Parcel C, Building 272, which was subsequently postponed). Installed additional monitoring wells to characterize groundwater plume, conducted baseline sampling, and began injections.

PARCEL B OCTOBER 2003 – NOVEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare and submit RTCs for the draft construction summary report. Prepare figures and tables for excavations not included in the draft construction summary report.
- Prepare and submit shoreline data gaps technical memorandum.
- Prepare and submit RTCs for the groundwater evaluation technical memorandum.
- Continue preparation of technical memorandum to support the proposed record of decision (ROD) amendment. Resolve risk assessment technical issues and identify applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements for technical memorandum and proposed ROD amendment.

- Prepare and submit final work plan for the Building 123 Ferox injection treatability study with RTCs. Complete Ferox injections and begin post-injection groundwater monitoring.
- Prepare and submit final April – June 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report with RTCs, pending receipt and resolution of agency comments.
- Prepare and submit final five-year review document, pending receipt and resolution of agency comments.
- Prepare and submit draft July – September 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report.
- Conduct October – December 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring.

PARCEL C SEPTEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Installed supplemental monitoring wells and conducted baseline sampling for follow-on Ferox injection treatability study at Building 272 (study also to include work at Parcel B, Building 123). Work at Building 272 has been indefinitely postponed due to expansion of work at Building 123.
- Continued waste consolidation work.

PARCEL C OCTOBER 2003 – NOVEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare and submit draft work plan for sequential anaerobic/aerobic bioremediation treatability study in Building 134.
- Perform Dry Dock 4 water sampling following receipt and resolution of agency comments on work plan. Coordinate plans for removal of keel blocks. The proposed work is required for Dry Dock 4 to be in the same condition as Dry Docks 2 and 3 (with the caisson tied off at the head of the dry dock).
- Continue waste consolidation work.

PARCEL D SEPTEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Addressed radiation screening survey results from Building 366.

PARCEL D OCTOBER 2003 – NOVEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare action memorandum and work plan for soil removal action.
- Continue human health risk assessment data evaluation.

- Continue addressing radiation screening survey results from Building 366.

PARCEL E SEPTEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Continued monitoring of the landfill gas control system. Performed maintenance activities at barrier wall to ensure effective performance of landfill gas control system.
- Began construction of the sedimentation basin for control of storm water discharge at the industrial landfill.
- Performed non-storm discharge visual inspections at the industrial landfill.
- Continued radiation screening surveys based on the findings of the historic radiological assessment (HRA).
- Continued waste consolidation work.
- Continued operation of groundwater extraction system at industrial landfill.

PARCEL E OCTOBER 2003 – NOVEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepare final landfill cap removal action closeout report with RTCs.
- Prepare and submit work plan for the IR-02 removal action (to be performed under the basewide radiation removal action).
- Prepare and submit final landfill gas characterization with RTCs.
- Prepare and submit RTCs for landfill extent report.
- Prepare final landfill liquefaction potential report with RTCs.
- Prepare and submit final report with RTCs for Phase III GDGI activities at Parcel E.
- Prepare draft shoreline characterization technical memorandum for the standard data gaps investigation.
- Prepare interim data analysis report for Phases 1 and 2 of the standard data gaps investigation.
- Prepare draft workplan for phyto-groundwater extraction treatability study at the industrial landfill.
- Continue preparation of draft landfill gas removal action closeout report.
- Continue construction of the sedimentation basin at IR-01/21.

- Perform storm water sampling during the first rain event of the wet season at the industrial landfill. Perform monthly storm water visual observations from October to May.
- Continue monitoring the landfill gas control system.
- Continue radiation screening surveys based on the findings of the HRA.
- Continue waste consolidation work.
- Continue operation of groundwater extraction system at industrial landfill.

PARCEL F SEPTEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Prepared and submitted RTCs for the data gaps investigation work plan. Began performing field work for data gaps investigation.

PARCEL F OCTOBER 2003 – NOVEMBER 2003 ACTIVITIES

- Continue field work for data gaps investigation and prepare field summary report.
- Prepare draft final VS report with RTCs.

2.0 SCHEDULE

This section presents meetings and deliverables conducted and planned during this reporting period.

Activities Conducted	Date
Basewide groundwater monitoring plan meeting	September 3, 2003
Submitted draft final five-year review document with RTCs	September 22, 2003
BCT monthly meeting	September 23, 2003
RAB meeting	September 25, 2003
Submitted draft work plan for follow-on SVE treatability study at Building 123	September 26, 2003

Activities Planned	Date
Submit draft final community involvement plan	October 2, 2003
Submit draft work plan for sequential anaerobic/aerobic biological treatability study at Building 134	October 2, 2003
Submit draft Parcel B shoreline data gaps technical memorandum	October 3, 2003
Submit final Parcel E GDGI report with RTCs	October 17, 2003
BCT monthly meeting	October 21, 2003

Activities Planned	Date
RAB meeting	October 23, 2003
Submit final work plan with RTCs for Parcel F data gaps investigation	October 2003
Submit draft July – September 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report	November 14, 2003
Submit draft groundwater monitoring plan	November 20, 2003
Submit final five-year review document*	November 21, 2003
Submit field summary report for Parcel F data gaps investigation	November 24, 2003
Submit RTCs for draft Parcel B construction summary report	November 26, 2003
Submit draft IR-02 removal action workplan	November 2003
Submit final landfill gas characterization report with RTCs*	November 2003
Submit final April – June 2003 quarterly groundwater monitoring report with RTCs*	November 2003
Submit final landfill lateral extent report with RTCs	November 2003
Submit RTCs for Parcel B groundwater evaluation technical memorandum	November 2003
Submit final work plan for follow-on Ferox injection treatability study at Building 123*	November 2003

Note:

* Document submittal pending receipt and/or resolution of BCT comments

3.0 OTHER

- The Navy is continuing to prepare the draft final HRA, which is planned for submittal in early 2004.
- The Navy submitted the draft base realignment and closure (BRAC) business plan on April 2, 2003. The Navy and regulatory agencies are working to resolve comments on the draft BRAC business plan.
- The draft community involvement plan (CIP, formerly referred to as the community relations plan) was submitted on June 6, 2003. The BCT and public review period for the draft CIP was extended until August 12, 2003. The draft final CIP was submitted on October 2, 2003. The Navy will prepare a final CIP for submittal in December 2003 pending receipt of agency and public comments.
- The Navy is preparing a basewide groundwater monitoring plan that is planned for submittal on November 20, 2003. A document scoping meeting was held on June 10, 2003, and a follow-on meeting was held on September 3, 2003.
- The Navy submitted a drinking water determination letter applicable to Parcels B, C, D, and E to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) on August 11, 2003. RWQCB submitted a concurrence letter on September 22, 2003.

- The Navy conducted a basewide inventory of stockpiles at HPS. The Navy completed this inventory and continued to evaluate necessary response actions in September 2003.



Hunters Point Shipyard Restoration Advisory Board Parcel E Landfill Gas Removal Action Update


October 23, 2003

Discussion Topics



- Landfill Gas Removal Action
- Landfill Gas Control System
- Extent and Level of Methane
- Grouting of Barrier Wall
- Methane at GMP24
- Additional Work

Extent of Methane Prior to Extraction April 2002 (Before Removal Action)



Objectives of Landfill Gas Removal Action




- Remove methane discovered beneath the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) compound
- Maintain regulatory limit of less than 5% within the UCSF compound

Determining Success




- Active Extraction:
 - Removal Action Goals*
 - ✓ Extraction Wells - less than 0.5% methane
 - ✓ UCSF GMPs - less than 1% methane
- Weekly monitoring:
 - Removal Action Goals*
 - ✓ Extraction Wells - less than 1% methane
 - ✓ UCSF GMPs - less than 2% methane
- Successful Completion of Removal Action/Start Monitoring:
 - ✓ 4 months below 5% methane


Landfill Gas Control System




Extent of Methane Prior to Extraction April 2002 (Before Removal Action)



Extent of Methane After Extraction February 2003



Methane At Fence Line GMPs




Maintenance Activities



- Monitoring indicated some communication across barrier west of GMP03A
- Grouted sections west of GMP03A to limit the communication across barrier wall
- Conducted maintenance activities:
 - Installed turbines on passive vents
 - Inspected bentonite
 - Inspected filters for proper operation
 - Checked gas flow rate throughout system



West Portion Landfill Gas Control System – Initial Grouting




Maintenance Activities



- Monitoring indicated grouting and maintenance activities had been effective
- Completed grouting of the remaining gaps in the problem area




Methane at UCSF GMPs




Elevated Methane at GMP24

October 9, 2003



Elevated Methane at GMP24 October 20, 2003



Additional Work



- Continue monitoring
- Use extraction blowers if necessary to assist passive vents
- December 2003 ⇒ install 6 additional GMPs on Crisp Avenue
- February 1, 2004 ⇒ Monitoring work plan to agencies

Questions and Answers





Hunters Point Ship

HRA Update

23 October 2003

Laurie L. Lowman
Director, Naval Low-Level
Radioactive Waste
Program



HRA Status Report

- Additional archive records have been researched
- A second draft is being finalized for internal Department of Defense (DoD) review
- Interview process has been completed
- New schedule

10/23/2003

HPS

2



Additional Records

- Naval Sea Systems Command Archives
 - Reviewed July 2003
 - Information on Triple A contracts
- National Association of Atomic Veterans (NAAV) Records
 - Reviewed August 2003
 - Little pertinent information for HRA
- Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) Archives
 - Reviewed October 2003
 - Small quantity of new information on HPS

10/23/2003

HPS

3



Second Internal DoD Review

- Significant comments made on first draft
- Extensive changes made to document
- New information incorporated
- DTRA and Army Corps of Engineers will be included in review process

10/23/2003

HPS

4



Personnel Interview

- Interview process concluded
- Information has been summarized as an appendix to HRA
- Final contacts being made with in-depth interviewees to approve inclusion of the information they provided in HRA
- Some interviewees reluctant to document verbal commentary

10/23/2003

HPS

5



New HRA Timeline

- Original August distribution delayed for multiple reasons:
 - Additional archive reviews
 - Conduct research
 - Incorporate additional information
 - Hurricane Isabel
 - Storm preparation
 - Power outage
 - Holiday weeks

10/23/2003

HPS

6



New HRA Timeline (Cont.)

- November 2003 – Distribute internal draft for DoD review
- December 2003 – Comments due to HRA Team
- Early 2004 – Distribute Draft Final HRA to regulators and public

10/23/2003

HPS

7



Upcoming Site Projects

- Building 366
- Parcel E
 - IR-02 Northwest and Central
 - Sedimentation Basin
 - Shoreline Survey Follow-up

10/23/2003

HPS

8



Building 366

- Subject of HRA Fact Sheet No. 3 (Sept 03)
 - Low level radium and cesium concentrations found within inactive ventilation system and in floor drains
- Work will require relocation of artists currently in building
 - Type and extent of work would disturb tenants if they are not relocated
- Navy working to identify alternate locations and to address artists concerns

10/23/2003

HPS

9



Building 366 Findings

- **Outdoor Release Limits**
(including background)

- Cesium (Cs)-137: 0.13 picocuries per gram (pCi/g)
- Radium (Ra)-226: 2.0 pCi/g
- Very conservative limits used to ensure long-term protection of public health

10/23/2003

HPS

10



Building 366 Findings (cont)

- **Inactive Ventilation System Samples**

- 2 samples above Ra-226 limits
 - Ra-226 Levels <MDA to 6.23 pCi/g
- 4 samples above Cs-137 limits
 - Cs-137 Levels 0.496 to 5.54 pCi/g

Cs = Cesium
MDA = Minimum Detectable Activity
pCi/g = Picocuries per gram
Ra = Radium

10/23/2003

HPS

11



Building 366 Findings (cont)

- **Floor Drain Samples**

- 4 samples above Ra-226 limits
 - Ra-226 Levels <MDA to 5.54 pCi/g
- 3 samples above Cs-137 limits
 - Cs-137 Levels <MDA to 0.697 pCi/g

Cs = Cesium
MDA = Minimum Detectable Activity
pCi/g = Picocuries per gram
Ra = Radium

10/23/2003

HPS

12



Building 366 Release Limit

- Established in coordination with California Department of Health Services
- Will be based on surface readings in disintegrations per minute (dpm)
- Based on Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Guide 1.86
- Compared to final status survey that will be conducted after remediation

10/23/2003

HPS

13



IR-02 Northwest and Central

- Area known to contain a concentrated number of radium devices
- Site work plan has been prepared for RASO review
- Will follow previously-established remediation protocols
- Release limit for radium is 2 pCi/g

10/23/2003

HPS

14



IR-02 NW and Central (Cont)

- Testing will be conducted to identify possible presence of other radionuclides and mixed waste
- All prudent safety precautions will be taken
- This action will address radiologically contaminated material and mixed waste

10/23/2003

HPS

15



Sedimentation Basin

- Small regrading effort southeast of landfill being conducted to control storm water discharge
- Sandblast grit discovered at site
- As is done with all sandblast grit at HPS, samples being processed for potential radiological contamination

10/23/2003

HPS

16



Parcel E Shoreline Survey

- Shoreline survey covers 1-1/2 miles of Parcel E
- Radiological scoping survey conducted in Summer 2001
- Survey covered from the low tide mark to 50 feet above mean tide

10/23/2003

HPS

17



Shoreline Survey Methods

- Shoreline was divided into 51, 150-foot wide grids
- Grids identified alphabetically
 - A through Z and AA through YY
- Each grid divided into 3 foot lanes
- Gamma readings taken at 2 to 3 foot intervals in each lane

10/23/2003

HPS

18



Shoreline Survey Results

- Over 90,000 readings taken
- 47 samples were taken
- Focus on identifying areas of concern for future actions
- Elevated levels (greater than twice background) in 44 of the 51 grids
- Concentrations of elevated counts found in certain areas

10/23/2003

HPS

19



Impact of Shoreline Survey

- Identification of areas of concern
- Delineation of future actions
- Prioritization of future actions
 - Time Critical Removal Actions

10/23/2003

HPS

20



Future Shoreline Actions

- Conduct sampling at areas with highest count rates
- Time Critical Removal Actions for areas of concentrated elevated counts
 - Metal Reef Area
 - Metal Slag Area

10/23/2003

HPS

21

Questions/Discussion




10/23/2003

HPS

22

Hunters Point Shipyard Historical Radiological Assessment Fact Sheet No. 4

October 2003



The Navy has made a commitment to keep the local community, Hunters Point Shipyard tenants, and federal, state and local regulators informed during preparation of the Historical Radiological Assessment.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Navy, as part of its Installation Restoration Program, is preparing the Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA). This fact sheet is the fourth in a continuing series to update the community on the progress made in creating the Draft Final HRA.

The HRA documents past radiological activities and investigations at HPS. The HRA report provides:

1. A baseline for investigating the remaining presence and extent of radiological materials,
2. Assessment of past and continuing radiological investigations, and
3. Recommendations for further actions.

This fact sheet also reports on activities being conducted

as a part of the Navy's continuing radiological investigation program. This issue focuses on cleanup activities scheduled for the northwest and central portions of a site in Parcel E called Installation Restoration (IR)-02.

HRA UPDATE


HRA Preparation – The Navy HRA Team is continuing its efforts to incorporate the results of months of research into an accurate and comprehensive HRA. This work has involved researching many archived documents and conducting extensive interviews. In early October 2003, information directly related to past radiological operations at HPS associated with Operation Crossroads and the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL) was identified in the archives of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. These documents are currently being reviewed by the HRA Team.

HRA Schedule – The release date for the HRA has been extended to allow for the review of the archived documents. The HRA is scheduled for release in early 2004.

IR-02 NORTHWEST AND CENTRAL

IR-02 Northwest and Central, a fill area located in Parcel E, is about six acres in size (see map inside). The Navy conducted several radiological investigations in this area between 1988 and 1996. These investigations found radioluminescent devices (see box inside) on the surface and buried in the soil down to a depth of 10 feet. All devices found on the surface were removed during these investigations.

Commonly used on Navy ships, radioluminescent devices were removed during ship repair and maintenance work at HPS from the late 1930s through the 1960s. During that time, it was common practice to dispose of radioluminescent devices in municipal and government landfills.





Keeping the Community Informed

WHAT'S BEING DONE

The Navy is planning to clean up the remaining radioluminescent devices in IR-02 Northwest and Central. This cleanup action is being taken to eliminate the potential future risk of low-level radiological materials migrating as the result of erosion, animal activity or future work activities at the site. The public and the environment are safe now and will continue to be safe during the cleanup work.

RADIOLUMINESCENT DEVICES – items such as gauges, dials, watches and ship's deck markers that contained a paint usually mixed with radium to make them visible in the dark.



Site IR-02, looking northwest toward San Francisco.

Keeping the Community Informed

WHAT'S PROPOSED

The cleanup action for IR-02 Northwest and Central is designed to excavate the area and separate radioluminescent devices and associated contaminated materials for disposal at a licensed off-site low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. The removal of the radioluminescent devices will be conducted under the Navy's Basewide Radiological Action Memorandum, and in a manner consistent with previous radiological cleanup work at HPS.

The focus of the cleanup action is the removal of radioluminescent devices and associated contaminated material as well as any debris encountered during excavation. While other contaminants are present in the soil, they will not be addressed during this cleanup action.


After the devices and affected soil are removed, the remaining soil will be put back and addressed as part of the larger CERCLA (Superfund) study of the entire IR-02 site.

All measures will be taken to protect the surrounding community and workers during the cleanup process. During excavation and backfilling, the soil will be kept moist to minimize dust. Stringent erosion controls will be used to prevent erosion during rainy conditions.

Work plans for this cleanup will be sent to the regulatory agencies and the public for review and comment in November 2003. The cleanup is expected to begin in early 2004.

The cleanup process is shown in the graphic below.

CLEANUP PROCESS



Keeping the Community Informed

WHAT'S NEXT

The Navy will continue to prioritize radiological surveys, investigations and cleanup actions at HPS. These priorities will be finalized based on the information that will be provided in the HRA.

The Navy will investigate any site where radiological operations may have been performed or radiological material may have been stored or disposed. It will ensure that all work is within current health and safety standards established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the State of California's Department of Health Services.

WHERE TO GET INFORMATION

Navy documents and other reference materials about HPS are available to the public at two different locations. The Main Library in downtown San Francisco contains a nearly complete record of all the documents related to the cleanup under way at HPS. The Bayview / Anna E. Waden Branch Library contains a smaller collection of documents and copies of current investigation reports. It also holds historic documents related to the HRA.

The Navy invites you to visit the libraries and read the reports to gain a more complete understanding of the cleanup activities. Addresses for the two Information Repository locations are:

City of San Francisco Main Library
Science, Technical, and Government Documents Room
100 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 557-4500 x 5075

Bayview / Anna E. Waden Branch Library
5075 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94124
(415) 715-4100

Website:

<http://www.efdswnavfac.navy.mil/environmental/hunterspoint.htm>



FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Keith Forman
BRAC Coordinator
Phone: (619) 532-0913
Fax: (619) 532-0995
E-mail: keith.forman@navy.mil

Mr. Lee Saunders
Public Affairs Officer
Phone: (619) 532-3100
Fax: (619) 532-1190
E-mail: saunderslh@efdswnavfac.navy.mil



RAB Economic Committee Report

11/07/03

Two Contractor Data Bases submitted to the Navy (CALTRANS & Human Rights Commission)

BDI is working on completing their local contractor Data Base for the ITSI contract with the Navy (targeted for November)

The Navy cited local BRAC law for local contractors, to be included in future RFP/contracts

The goal is utilizing local resources (companies and organizations), available to the prime contractors to insure local participation in the remediation process.

The Economic Committee would like to see a monthly report of all newly released scope of work/contracts released with a percentage break down of local participation, cumulating in a quarterly report.

Please see attached supporting law for local contractors

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMAND, DISTRICT
COMMAND, FIELD OPERATING ACTIVITY & LABORATORY COUNSELS

SUBJECT: CECC-C Bulletin No. 00-12, Lessons Learned from Ocuto Blacktop & Paving Co., Inc., B-284165

1. On March 1, 2000, the Comptroller General sustained a pre-award protest by Ocuto Blacktop & Paving Co., Inc. (Ocuto) against award of a contract for the capping of a landfill at the former Griffiss Air Force Base (AFB) in Rome, New York. Ocuto alleged that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) failed to comply with a statutory requirement that government agencies give preference, to the maximum extent possible, to contracting with local, small, and small disadvantaged businesses for work associated with closing military installations under a base closure law. The Comptroller General held that the USACE solicitation for a regional environmental remediation indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract failed to give reasonable consideration to the practicability of providing a preference to local contractors.

2. In 1993, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission nominated Griffiss for decommissioning under the BRAC Act, and the base officially closed in September 1995. Section 2912 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-160, which is codified at 10 U.S.C. § 2687 note, established the following preference for businesses located in the vicinity of base closure and realignment work:

- (a) Preference required. -- In entering into contracts with private entities as part of the closure or realignment of a military installation under a base closure law, the Secretary of Defense shall give preference, to the greatest extent practicable, to qualified businesses located in the vicinity of the installation and to small business concerns and small disadvantaged business concerns. Contracts for which this preference shall be given shall include contracts to carry out activities for the environmental restoration and mitigation at military installations to be closed or realigned.

The statutory preference is implemented in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) at § 226.7103(a). The DFARS provides that a contracting officer (CO) must determine "whether there is a reasonable expectation that offers will be received from responsible business concerns located in the vicinity of the military installation that is being closed or realigned," before making a small business or small disadvantaged business (SDB) set-aside determination. The regulations prohibit the use

of set-asides when the CO's market research indicates that local business offers can be expected, unless an offer is expected from a local business within the set aside category.¹ If offers from businesses in the vicinity are not expected, the CO should continue with section 8(a) or set-aside consideration as stated in DFARS Part 219.² In other words, the regulation establishes a priority for awarding to local businesses over 8(a) or other small businesses.

3. Upon request from Region II of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), USACE established pre-placed remedial action contracts (PRAC) for environmental remediation actions for civil or military projects within the geographic boundaries of EPA Region II and the Northwestern Division. These combined areas cover 15 states and two U.S. territories. The PRAC work will include projects at any current or former military installations within the established area, however none of the PRAC contracts are limited to BRAC projects. Griffiss AFB is in the BRAC program and BRAC funds will be used to cap the landfill as part of a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) remediation required by EPA.

4. Until the mid-1990s, the District had endeavored to accomplish this type of work through site specific contracts, but determined that method of contracting to be against the Government's interests of cost, staff resources, and time. Experience showed that it cost the District approximately \$200,000 to \$500,000 for each small acquisition to do site specific contracting. In 1996, USACE successfully defeated a protest against award of a contract for removal of underground storage tanks at Griffiss AFB.³ USACE had issued a solicitation for all work at Griffiss related to base closure, including soil testing to determine the presence of contamination caused by leakage. Among the five evaluation factors listed in the request for proposal (RFP) were local business preference and subcontracting with local and small businesses. USACE made award to the offeror whose proposal represented the best overall value to the Government. The awardee's price was slightly higher than the protester, however, the awardee scored significantly higher on the technical evaluation because it was located in a county in the vicinity of Griffiss AFB and proposed that a majority of the work would be performed by local subcontractors. The GAO accepted the CO's explanation that his greatest concern was for the Government to receive the best quality under a best value formula and that the policy objectives of DFARS Subpart 226.71 be fulfilled to the greatest extent possible. In the Ocutto protest decision, the Comptroller General referred to this 1996 remediation procurement as exemplary.⁴ In the instant procurement, rather than prepare a site specific RFP, USACE issued a regional IDIQ solicitation.

¹ DFARS § 226.7103 (c); Ocutto Blacktop & Paving Co., Inc., B-284165, Mar. 1, 2000.

² DFARS § 226.7103 (b).

³ GZA Remediation, Inc., B-272386, Oct. 3, 1996, 96-2 Comp. Gen. Dec. ¶ 155.

⁴ Ocutto, B-284165, at note 2.

5. USACE published a Commerce Business Daily notice, establishing May 19, 1998 as the prescribed proposal due date. It then created mailing lists for prospective offerors by compiling names of all contractors who requested to be included on the lists. Only those who requested to be on the mailing lists received solicitations. USACE issued three solicitations for PRACs. One solicitation was issued without restrictions, the second was set aside for small businesses, and the third was reserved for small disadvantaged businesses in the Small Business Administration's (SBA) 8(a) set aside program. Each of the solicitations contemplated award of multiple IDIQ contracts. The landfill cap project at Griffiss AFB was to be ordered under one of the two contracts under the 8(a) set aside solicitation. Ocuto was on the mailing list for each of the three solicitations and was among the prospective offerors to whom solicitations were mailed on March. According to the CO, Ocuto did not respond to any of the solicitations. Ocuto claims it cannot recall receiving any of the solicitations

6. USACE selected Cape Environmental Management, Inc. (Cape) for award of the 8(a) contract for all remediation work within EPA Region II. USACE submitted an RFP for capping a landfill at Griffiss AFB to Cape on November 1, 1999. During negotiations, the contract specialist encouraged Cape to solicit quotes from subcontractors in the local Griffiss AFB vicinity, and Cape agreed to use such quotes if it received award. USACE intended to award the base IDIQ contract and the initial task order to cap the landfill at Griffiss simultaneously. Award had not been made by the time Ocuto filed its protest at the GAO, and USACE therefore suspended award.

7. Ocuto, a local contractor, learned from a representative of the BRAC commission that a contract for landfill capping at Griffiss was pending award to Cape, which is located in Waukegan, Illinois. Ocuto filed its GAO protest disputing USACE's failure to award to a contractor in the Rome, New York vicinity, on November 22, 1999. In response, USACE submitted a request for summary dismissal on the bases that (a) the GAO has no jurisdiction over a protest that challenges award of a task order under an IDIQ contract and (b) Ocuto's protest was untimely filed. USACE asserted that the statutory prohibition against protests in connection with the issuance of task orders and Ocuto's failure to file its protest within 10 days of its receipt of the solicitation, mandated dismissal of the protest. The GAO flatly denied the request on both counts. First, Ocuto's challenge is aimed at the solicitation's failure to mention environmental remediation work at closing military bases in the terms describing the underlying IDIQ contracts, not at the delivery order. Therefore, GAO claimed jurisdiction under its authority to review protests alleging a solicitation violates a statute or regulation. Second, because the solicitation gave inadequate notice to potential offerors that BRAC environmental projects were within its scope, Ocuto could not have been expected to protest the agency's interpretation of the solicitation prior to the proposal due date. GAO considered the protest timely because it was filed within 10 days of the date Ocuto knew of its basis for protest.

8. In its decision sustaining Ocuto's position, the Comptroller General provided an extensive analysis of the statutory and regulatory preference for awarding BRAC work to local and small businesses. The statute requires an agency to give reasonable consideration to whether the preference is practicable. The Comptroller General explained that "where Congress directs that a preference be given to the greatest extent practicable, an agency must either provide the preference or articulate a reasoned explanation of why it is impracticable to do so." This includes considering alternative solutions. The shortcoming of the USACE procurement strategy was the failure to record any consideration of alternative methods for implementing the local contractor preference.

9. The Comptroller General provided a short list of alternatives USACE might have considered, to include:

- (a) carving out the BRAC-related work and creating a separate contracting opportunity,
- (b) creating a schedule of regional IDIQ contractors, or
- (c) including a contractual requirement in the IDIQ contracts directing contractors to subcontract with local businesses.

Even if USACE had found these alternatives were impracticable, the Comptroller General ruled, the agency would have had to demonstrate that it had made a reasonable analysis of the possibilities. The existing record failed to address those factors that might make the alternatives impractical, such as budgeting and staffing constraints, the degree of local capability, and the number of projects subject to the preference. The Comptroller General concluded that in addition to failing to meet the statutory local business preference, USACE fell short of the regulatory mandate that the CO conduct market research and make a finding of whether local businesses could be reasonably expected to submit offers. Evidence of Ocuto's interest in participating made USACE's decision to proceed with an 8(a) set aside contract for the remediation improper.⁵

10. It was the USACE position that implementation of a statutory preference for local contractors is within the discretion of the Department of Defense. Relying on Ocuto Blacktop and Paving Co. v. Perry,⁶ USACE contended that its actions in executing its discretionary duty to implement a local preference had been sufficient to meet the statutory requirement. In Ocuto v. Perry, Ocuto had claimed that the Air Force's use of IDIQ contracts for environmental remediation denied small contractors the opportunity to successfully bid on work at a base closed under the BRAC law, in violation of Public Law 103-160, § 2912. The Comptroller General, however, was able to distinguish the court's decision refusing to compel the agency's discretion to be exercised in a particular manner. In that case, because local businesses in the vicinity of the BRAC work had

⁵ DFARS § 226.7103 (c).

⁶ 942 F. Supp., 783, 787 (N.D.N.Y.1996) (denying mandamus forcing the Secretary of Defense to institute a local preference).

other opportunities available the court found mandamus jurisdiction inappropriate. The Comptroller General affirmed that the statutory preference is not mandatory, but it does require an agency to give reasonable consideration to the practicability of a local business preference. In the instant case, USACE failed to produce any documentation in the record articulating why the preference is impracticable.

11. The CO asserted that under the circumstances, it was too costly and administratively unwieldy to conduct a site specific solicitation with a preference for local and small businesses. USACE contended that time, expense and growing workload combined with staff reductions made the implementation of the local preference impracticable. Moreover, the USACE defended the appropriate exercise of the CO's discretion in deciding to use IDIQ contracts as the procurement instrument. By encouraging Cape to work with local suppliers, USACE claimed it was accommodating the statutory local preference policy in the context of a different and, under the circumstances, necessary acquisition strategy. Ultimately, the opinion concluded that USACE had made an insufficient effort to consider and implement alternatives such as those referenced in paragraph 9, *supra*.

12. The lesson learned in this case is that regional IDIQ contracting for BRAC projects appears to be unworkable in light of statutory and regulatory preferences for local contractors. Award of contracts related to the closure or realignment of military bases cannot be processed without specific compliance with DFARS §226.7103. The acquisition plan must reflect compliance with the DFARS, especially where discretion is exercised. The option of site-specific contracting for BRAC work should be seriously considered. In those circumstances where giving preference to local businesses is indeed found impracticable, the CO should consider whether other alternatives exist to maximize the use of local contractors and carefully document his or her conclusion in a reasoned analysis. Some thought should be given to modeling future solicitations after the RFP in GZA Remediation, B-272386, *supra*, which included locality as a technical evaluation factor.

13. The point of contact for this matter is Karen Da Ponte, who can be reached at (202) 761-8541.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

/s/

ROBERT M. ANDERSEN
Chief Counsel

Section 2912 of the FY 1994 Defense Authorization Act (Pub. L. 103-160) established the following preference for businesses located in the vicinity of base closure and realignment work:

- (a) Preference required. – In entering into contracts with private entities as part of the closure or realignment of a military installation under a base closure law, the Secretary of Defense shall give preference, to the greatest extent practicable, to qualified businesses located in the vicinity of the installation and to small business concerns and small disadvantaged business concerns. Contracts for which this preference shall be given shall include contracts to carry out activities for the environmental restoration and mitigation at military installations to be closed or realigned.

DFARS Subpart 226.71 (REFERENCE FOR LOCAL AND SMALL BUSINESSES) and DFARS Subpart 226.72 (BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS) implement the requirements of Section 2912 of the FY 1994 Defense Authorization Act (Pub. L. 103-160).

Section 817 of the FY 1995 Defense Authorization Act (Pub. L. 103-337) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to give preference to entities that plan to hire local residents, when entering into contracts for services to be performed at a military installation that is affected by closure or alignment under a base closure law.

DFARS 226.7104 (OTHER CONSIDERATIONS) implements the requirements of Section 817 of the FY 1995 Defense Authorization Act (Pub. L. 103-337). DFARS 226.7104 states:

“When planning for contracts for services related to base closure activities at a military installation affected by a closure or realignment under a base closure law, contracting officers shall consider including, as a factor in source selection, the extent to which offerors specifically identify and commit, in their proposals, to a plan to hire residents of the vicinity of the military installation that is being closed or realigned.”

HPS Membership/Bylaws & Community Outreach (MB&CO) Subcommittee
Meeting Notes
Meeting Minutes for 14 October 2003, 6-8pm
San Francisco Public Library, Anna E. Waden Branch

*Note** These minutes are not verbatim but through summarization reflect the issues and statements made during the meeting. These notes were taken by Joni Jorgensen-Risk.*

Please note the new committee name - Membership/Bylaws & Community Outreach (MB&CO)

The Subcommittee meeting was called to order by Melita Rines, RAB member and Subcommittee Interim Leader, at 6:09 pm. Additional RAB members in attendance at the meeting were Lynne Brown, RAB Community Co-Chair; Lea Loizos, ARC Ecology; Helen Jackson; Charles Dacus Sr.; and Keith Tisdell, Subcommittee Leader. Also in attendance were Keith Forman, BRAC Navy Co-Chair; Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech; and Joni Jorgensen-Risk, ITSI. Also, Regina Mitchell, local community member was present. Topics on the agenda: (1) Current Lease Negotiations with SFRA/SFPD, (2) Community Notification Plan Update, (3) Draft Final Community Involvement Plan Update, and (4) Community Information Fair Update.

CURRENT LEASE NEGOTIATIONS with SFRA/SFPD

Melita Rines opened the meeting and the floor to Mr. Forman. Mr. Forman stated that Don Capobres, SFRA, was not able to attend this meeting this evening or to send a representative; however, Mr. Forman said that he and Mr. Capobres had discussed the RAB members concerns regarding current lease negotiations between SFRA and SFPD. SFRA is currently working on the term sheet (document that identifies the specific terms of the lease in a short summary format) that will become a part of the negotiated lease and said that Mr. Capobres indicated that he would allow a comment period by RAB members, the CFC, and the CAC, on the term sheet prior to the final lease agreement.

Additional items discussed included SFPD maneuver activities on Parcel A, federal police assigned to HPS, problems with SFRA and Lennar regarding the Disposition and Development Agreement (the legally binding contract between the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and Lennar/BVHP, the primary developer that will establish the requirements for the first phase of development) and additional subleases by SFPD under their contract to SFRA. Mr. Forman suggested that a list of questions be drafted and submitted to Mr. Capobres from the RAB members regarding their concerns. They could then request that Mr. Capobres respond to those questions at the next subcommittee meeting.

Additionally, issues about the use of the helipad were discussed. Items discussed included several that appeared in violation of the sublease; flight pattern/approach to the helipad, hours of operation, frequency of flights, and disturbance to soils. Additional concerns were raised regarding emergency services in general that are active at HPS and the need for accountability and respect of the local community that are impacted by their sirens and lights at all hours. It was suggested that Mr. Brown and Mr. Tisdell start logging the helicopter flight incidents at HPS and include date and time to report back the SFRA. Ms. Hunter captured the questions and comments of the RAB subcommittee members in attendance and will develop a list that will be submitted to Mr. Capobres. Additionally, Ms. Jorgensen-Risk will circulate an email announcement to all RAB members that the subcommittee is seeking input on the SFRA and SFPD lease, reminding RAB members that there is a hard copy of the sublease in the repository. She suggested that she would determine if additional hard copies would be needed for those interested in reviewing and providing additional questions for Mr. Capobres. Additional copies will be requested from Mr. Capobres. Ms. Jackson requested a copy of the sublease for her review.

DISCUSSION ON NAVY'S OUTREACH EFFORTS

There was some discussion regarding the Navy's community outreach efforts and their efforts to improve the scope of that outreach. It was agreed that the Navy's concept of purchasing the 94124 mailing list and completing a postcard mailing session announcing the CIF was a solid and sound effort to reach all ethnic communities in the HPS-Bayview area. Ms. Rines reminded those in attendance that the reason the Membership and Bylaws subcommittee had been expanded was to create a forum outside of the RAB

meetings for the local community to come and discuss their concerns. She also suggested that they focus their attentions on areas where they can make a difference. Ms. Jackson stated that there is an issue regarding the fact that *The Independent* newspaper is no longer being circulated on the hill. The hill is home to 600+ Bayview residents that are directly impacted by the activities taking place at HPS. Also, *The Independent* is one of the vehicles the Navy uses to announce the local RAB meetings. There was also some discussion regarding the Navy's cleanup effort and the gains that have been made just in the last 6 months.

DRAFT FINAL COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN (CIP)

Ms. Hunter provided an update on the CIP; the draft final document was submitted for public review on 2 October 2003. All RAB members that requested a hard copy should have received one. Ms. Jackson was provided with a copy at the meeting. Any changes/suggestions can still be submitted to Ms. Hunter for inclusion in the final document.

COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION PLAN (CNP)

Mr. Forman stated that the Navy is working on the needed updates to the Community Notification Plan and suggested that the MB&CO subcommittee meeting is an excellent forum for discussing needed changes and updates. All in attendance agreed and Mr. Forman suggested that he would bring a copy of the document to the next subcommittee meeting for review and discussion. He would also bring the current email address list to be updated. Additional items discussed included contacting the 12 schools in the 94124 area for contact information and to schedule a meeting with them to discuss the CNP scope and intention and how best to include them in it. Also it was determined that there is the need to define/refine the concept of an "incident".

COMMUNITY INFORMATION FAIR

Mr. Forman then provided an update on the status of the efforts underway for the Community Information Fair that has been rescheduled for 15 November 2003. Mr. Brown requested an electronic copy of the flyer for his personal distribution. It was determined that the flyer would be submitted electronically to all RAB members for personal distribution in addition to a postcard mailer to be sent to all residents in the 94124 zip code.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Brown state that the SFPD had been on HPS either Sunday or Monday of that week (10/12 or 13). The RAB members were interested in obtaining a copy of the incident report and the Navy agreed to look into the incident and report back to the subcommittee.

The next Membership & Bylaws meeting will be held 5 November 2003 from 6:00 - 8:00 pm at the Anna Waden Library. We hope to have Don Capobres available to respond to our questions and comments regarding current lease negotiations with SFPD and we will also be reviewing anticipated updates to the Community Notification Plan. The Navy agreed to extend an invitation to Mr. Capobres to attend the November 5, 2003 MB & CO subcommittee meeting when they send the SFRA Lease Agreement comments discussed during the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

MB & CO SUBCOMMITTEE OCTOBER 2003 ACTION ITEMS

1. Mr. Capobres will facilitate a comment period by RAB members, the CFC, and the CAC, on the term sheet prior to the final lease agreement.
2. Mr. Brown and Mr. Tisdell agreed to start logging the helicopter flight incidents at HPS and include date and time to report back the SFRA.
3. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk will circulate an email announcement to all RAB members that the subcommittee is seeking input on the SFRA and SFPD lease, reminding RAB members that there is a hard copy of

the sublease in the repository. In the email, Ms. Jorgensen-Risk would determine if additional hard copies would be needed for those interested in reviewing and providing additional questions for Mr. Capobres.

4. The Navy will request additional hardcopies copies of the lease agreement from Mr. Capobres.
5. Any changes/suggestions on the CIP can still be submitted to Ms. Hunter for inclusion in the final document.
6. Mr. Forman suggested that he would bring a copy of the CNP to the next subcommittee meeting for review and discussion.
7. The CIF flyer would be submitted electronically by Ms. Jorgensen-Risk to all RAB members for personal distribution in addition to a postcard mailer to be sent to all residents in the 94124 zip code.
8. The Navy agreed to extend an invitation to Mr. Capobres to attend the November 5, 2003 MB & CO subcommittee meeting when they send the SFRA Lease Agreement comments discussed during the meeting.

**FOOD
WINE
INFORMATION
EMPOWERMENT!**

***Community Window on the
Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup***

***Community Open House
Soul Food & Wine Reception***

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Friday, November 7, 2003

4634 Third Street, San Francisco







Come to the inaugural open house of the Community Window on the Shipyard Cleanup's new office in Bayview Hunters Point! See the displays and meet the people who are working with you to ensure that the cleanup of the Hunters Point Shipyard meets your goals for health, safety and environmental protection. The event is being catered by Jesse's International, so come hungry for food and information!

Questions? Contact Arc Ecology at (415) 495-1786


*The Community Window on the Shipyard Cleanup is a project of Arc Ecology,
funded by the San Francisco Department of the Environment.*

**Community Window on the Shipyard Cleanup, 4634 Third Street, San Francisco
<http://www.communitywindowontheshipyard.org> • 1-800-WINDOW-8**

*Some of the conditions that
are recognized as health
nuisances by the San
Francisco health code
and other laws include:*

- Garbage accumulation 
- Indoor mold
- Rat, mice, or insect infestations 
- Neglected and overgrown vegetation
- Stagnant water causing mosquito Breeding 
- Bird and animal waste
- Safety Hazards
- Offensive odors
- Too many pets 
- Unsanitary living conditions, Hoarding 
- Inoperative vehicles on private property 

City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
Environmental Health Section
Public Services and Complaint Program
1390 Market St., Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94102



We Can Help



artwork by Mona Caron

*We Are the
Public Services and
Complaint program
of the Environmental
Health section of the San
Francisco Department of
Public Health
(415) 252-3805*

By Working Together We Can Keep Our Neighborhoods Safe and Healthy

You can report harmful or unsanitary conditions in your building or other private property in your neighborhood.

You may remain anonymous.

What We Do

We give information, assistance and referrals on a variety of hazards and nuisances

We investigate complaints of unsanitary conditions and issue notices to correct them, when appropriate.

We take enforcement action against neglected private property when needed.

We work with property owners, tenants, tourists, hotels, business owners and employees and government agencies to correct Health code violations.

We can speak to your group about pest control, mold, and our other activities

We evaluate the homes of asthma patients to help reduce triggers in the home environment, at no charge, if referred by a doctor.



We support your interest In your community

If you want to know if and how we can assist you with your situation, or if you just have a question, *you can reach us in several ways:*

Phone: Reception (415) 252-3800
Complaint Desk and Voice Recorder (415) 252-3805

Fax: (415) 252-3875 or 252-3930

Walk-in: 1390 Market Street, Suite 210
Fox Plaza (Market at Polk)
8:30 AM – 12:00 Noon
1:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Monday – Friday

Mail: Complaint Program
1390 Market Street, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web site: <http://www.dph.sf.ca.us/ehs>

Another resource that can help with environmental problems:

“Guide to San Francisco Environmental Services” published by the San Francisco Department of the Environment.

For Copies, call (415) 554-6390

Additional Contacts

Hazardous Materials/ Hazardous Waste SPILLS 911

Dumping Chemicals into Sewers
(415) 695-7320

Gas Odors- PG & E
1 (800) 743-8000

Animal Abuse & Neglect
(415) 554-6365 or (415) 554-9400

Animal Bites
(415) 554-9433



Fire Hazards
(415) 558-3300

Garbage on Public Streets
(415) 695-2017
Sewage On Street or Sidewalk
(415) 695-2017 or 695-2020 (after hours)

Abandoned Vehicles on Street
(415) 553-9817

Public Housing Maintenance
(415) 715-3117

Department of Building Inspection
Neglected Buildings & construction sites
(415) 558-6088
Interior repairs to multi unit buildings
DBI Housing Inspection
(415) 558-6220

SF Neighborhood Fix-it Chart
<http://freeprintshop.org> or (415) 648-3222



PLEASE POST

The San Francisco Human Rights Commission
In conjunction with Assemblyman Mark Leno's Office,
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell's Office, the Mayor's Office of
Neighborhood Services, and the SF Department of the Environment

ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM WORKSHOP IV Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant

Wednesday, October 29, 2003, 6:00pm to 9:00pm

Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Community Room

Southeast Community Facility, 1800 Oakdale Avenue

The Commission is responding to residents of the BVHP
who requested an investigation into Environmental Racism.

HRC Phone 415-252-2500 Fax 415-431-5764 www.sfhrc.org

February 2, 2004

Diane Silva
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1220 Pacific Highway, Building 127
San Diego, CA 92132

RE: Navy Administrative Record files

Dear Diane,

Enclosed, please find (4) reports

1. Basewide Env. Baseline Survey for Engineering Field Activity West – Final 6/3/96, Vol. 1 and 2
2. Draft Final – Basewide Finding of Suitability to Lease (excluding Parcel A), January 7, 1998 *RECORD # 793*
3. Treasure Island Naval Station/Hunters Point Annex Superfund Site, Parcel Site Deletion (Parcel A – Deletion Docket & Index) *RECORD # 796*
4. Public Information Materials from October 23, 2003 *RECORD # 797*

for inclusion in the Navy Administrative Record for Hunters Point Shipyard. These original reports were previously housed in the Anna Waden Branch Library (Info Repository) in San Francisco but are not listed on the most recent Admin Record Index. At the request of the HPS Lead RPM, these reports are being forwarded to you so that they become part of the Administrative Record. Photocopies of the reports have already been made by I.T.S.I. personnel and have been replaced in the IR.

If you have any questions, please contact Arvind Acharya at 415/657-0346 or Ronald Keichline at 619/666-1797.

Thank you,


Debra Moore
Community Relations Coordinator

/dm

Enclosures